

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Res. 442. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the convoking of a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the refugee problem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 443. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses incurred by the House Committee on Banking and Currency in conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 86; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 10090. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Botta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 10091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Jeske; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. R. 10092. A bill for the relief of Theresa Asphar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 10093. A bill for the relief of Taeko Takamura Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10094. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 10095. A bill for the relief of Helen Michalea and Konstantinos E. Skopeteas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 10096. A bill for the relief of Olin Fred Rundlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

What Is Government's Responsibility to American Agriculture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "What Is Government's Responsibility to American Agriculture?" which was delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] at the annual meeting of the Illinois Agricultural Association on November 13, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO AMERICAN AGRICULTURE?

(Address by Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND)

I think it was Henry Mencken who once said, "Any generalization on any subject, including this one, is inevitably wrong." This is certainly true of the subject assigned to me. It would be easy, but dangerous, to generalize on the subject of government's responsibility to American agriculture.

Nevertheless, there are a few generalizations we need to make before proceeding.

I'm speaking to you as one who has devoted his entire life, with the exception of the duties of being a Senator, to farming. My principal farming enterprise has been the production and marketing of cotton. However, the continued operation of the Government's cotton program has caused me to change my business so that I am now devoting over two-thirds of my acreage to the production of soybeans, feed grains, and livestock. Even though I recognize my responsibility as a Member of the United States Senate and as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I wish to address my remarks today as one farmer to another.

In our concentration upon the immediate problems of our time it is well to remind ourselves that there are some basic overriding principles which have made America what it is today. We are inclined to take these principles for granted—but we cannot afford this luxury. They are constantly under fire, not by frontal attack, but by the process of chipping away a little here and a little there. One of these basic principles is the principle of private ownership in a competitive economy. A second is the maintenance of strong and responsible gov-

ernment at the State and local level. The basic concept of the American society, as I see it, is the dispersal of economic power by the institution of private ownership, and the dispersal of political power by dividing such power between the three branches of the Federal Government and between the Federal Government and the States and the people. These are the arches that hold up the capstone of liberty.

At any point where a breach is made in one of the walls to divide and separate these powers, the fundamental rights and freedom of all the people are endangered. We in the south deeply and sincerely believe that the control and operation of public schools is and always has been a State and local matter. When the Central Government breaches the division of powers and orders a crack combat division into a State to force the entry of Negro children into a white public school, it is a matter of vital concern to each and every individual in every State in the Union. When the constitutional balance of political power is destroyed in one place it is just as effectively destroyed in every other, although any new overt acts may not have been committed.

Rural people have had a clearer insight into the significance of these basic principles of freedom and prosperity than many of our urban friends—and it is to rural people that many of us who hold these principles dear, look to, to support and maintain the basic concepts without which all else would be bitter fruit.

The Farm Bureau of Illinois, which I understand has upward of 200,000 farm family members, has a tremendous responsibility in making sure that farmers understand clearly government's responsibility to agriculture. Let me say that the Illinois Agricultural Association, which is the Farm Bureau affiliate, together with the Farm Bureaus in the other 47 States, offer the greatest hope for determining government's proper responsibility to agriculture. I hope you will not fall in this responsibility.

One of the paramount contributions that Government can make to the welfare of farm people is to take such measures as may be appropriate to avoid excessive fluctuations in the general level of business activity and the general price level.

There are certain fundamental truths that we should always keep before us. I'd like to list a few of these for you, and I am sorry that time will not permit a complete discussion because each one of these points, if correctly developed, would take all the time that has been allotted me. These are as follows:

(1) You cannot multiply wealth by dividing it.

(2) You cannot legislate the poor into freedom and wealth by legislating the wealthy out of it.

(3) Governments cannot give to people what they do not first take away from the people. (The power to tax misused is the power of destruction.)

(4) That which one man receives without working for, another man must work for without receiving it.

(5) The Government cannot guarantee you a fair price or income without all-out controls, with their great limitations in opportunity to create the goods that constitute real wealth.

(6) Uncle Sam must finally dish out money on the basis of equal shares—and to a politician this is 1 share, 1 vote.

(7) The Socialists and the Communists, those who would divide the wealth, never get tired. We do.

As we discuss Government's responsibility to American agriculture, let us keep these fundamental truths in mind.

No matter how difficult the problems of farmers may be at this time, I think few would deny that they would be immeasurably worse if the level of business activity were to slacken off substantially.

We seem to have developed a situation in this country in which the orthodox remedies of fiscal and monetary action have demonstrated their capacity to level off a boom, but not as yet been effective in stopping the upward trend in prices.

This, too, is harmful to farmers, because undercurrent conditions of actual and potential overproduction of farm products, price inflation does not significantly increase farm prices, but does significantly increase the price of things that farmers buy.

Currently, the general price level is 21 percent higher than the 1947-49 average. This means that the value of the dollar as a medium of exchange has declined a fifth during the past decade.

During 19 of the past 20 months the price level has increased. This is like saying that in 19 of the past 20 months the value of the dollar has been reduced.

We in Congress who have, under the Constitution, an obligation to regulate the value of money, need to find out why, and to take action to prevent the continuing deterioration in the value of our currency. I have my own ideas on this that time does not permit me to develop. Suffice it to say that in my view this is a responsibility that government has to farmers, as to other groups, and that the manner in which this responsibility is handled is of paramount importance to farmers—even more so than some of the other activities more directly related to agriculture.

I think, too, that government has a responsibility to keep open the channels of international trade for the disposition of farm products. Farmers have a big stake, bigger than they often appreciate, in a high level of trade between nations. The agricultural situation today would be immeasur-

ably more critical had it not been for the expansion in farm exports in recent years.

Exports of farm products are several times as high as imports of competitive products. The average commercial farmer sells about \$1,000 worth of farm products to foreign markets. Not only is this important in itself but if any significant portion of this production had to be disposed of in domestic markets the impact upon domestic prices would be catastrophic. Even farmers who do not produce commodities that move into export outlets have a major stake in a high level of foreign trade, because most farms are suitable for the production of many commodities. If cotton exports decline, for example, much of the land now used for cotton will go into the production of grain, feed and livestock products, with harmful consequences to farmers in other areas.

Unfortunately, much of the current high level of farm exports is artificially induced by one or more Government programs. For example, farm exports would be far lower were it not for what is generally called the Public Law 480 program—the program of exporting farm products for foreign currencies. I know that this program originated in the Farm Bureau. I think we must continue this program at least temporarily because, assuming the existence of surplus stocks, it makes good sense to make use of them to aid in the progress of undeveloped countries. Nevertheless, I look forward to the day when such programs can be curtailed or eliminated, because it does not appear they provide an adequate underpinning for a permanent farm export program. It would not be wise for agriculture to come to depend too much on an artificial inducement to high farm exports.

In the fields of research, extension, the preservation and wise use of our land and water resources, farm credit and farm marketing services—I expect there would be almost unanimous agreement that these are programs that are well justified, not only in the interest of farm people, but in the interest of the general public as well.

I suppose that the subject assigned to me presupposes that I would talk primarily about national farm price policy—and I have now gotten to that point. I felt that it was necessary to begin with the more general comments that I have made in order to make it perfectly clear that in my mind these are the fundamental overriding issues that are the important things to farmers and to their real and long-run prosperity.

Among my colleagues opinion runs the full gamut on this question of national farm price policy—from those who believe that every governmental intervention into the price system is fundamentally inconsistent with our economic system with harmful long-run effects upon those supposedly benefited—to those who think that farmers cannot survive economically without Government price fixing on all or most commodities. And this variance in viewpoint is but a reflection of the diversity of opinion that exists among farmers with respect to this most difficult and perplexing of public policy issues.

Part of the answer to the question of my subject—what is Government's responsibility to American agriculture—is that those of us who have been placed in a position to do so by the electorate have a tremendous responsibility to look carefully and honestly and intelligently at the economics of the problem, and particularly at the long-run results and consequences of any proposal. In this endeavor we should give appropriate consideration to any conclusions that may be drawn from the experience to date with national farm programs. There is just no excuse for not learning from experience. They say the reason history repeats itself is that no one was listening the first time.

If we do look at the experience of the past we cannot, I think, avoid certain conclusions.

The price-support programs of the past, and specifically the policy of setting price supports at or close to 90 percent of parity may have helped some farmers in a given year.

But such programs have set in motion certain long-range developments which have turned out to be harmful to the ability of farm people to earn satisfactory incomes.

We have artificially encouraged production beyond what the market can take.

We have promoted competitive production in other countries.

We have expanded the use of synthetic substitutes.

We have lost markets that often, tragically, cannot be regained.

We have tended to fragmentize the right to produce.

We have built up surpluses, expensive to the public to maintain, and depressing in their impact upon farm incomes.

We have imposed restrictions upon the ability of individual producers to improve the efficiency of their operations.

We have diverted acreage from controlled crops to other commodities, in particular into feed and livestock production.

Mississippi has increased livestock by 93 percent in the last 5 years, and irrigated corn is producing fantastic yields in my State. Small cotton allotments are putting small farmers in the dairy and poultry production business throughout the South.

The program and the consequences of the program have indeed become a part of the problem—have made the problem more difficult to deal with.

I wish time would permit me to review for you the history of the agricultural adjustment program as applied to cotton. I am sure that there is a lesson in this experience for the farmers of the Midwest and for that matter the entire country. As a producer of cotton, I have seen my right to produce, steadily but surely, eroded away. I have been forced to reduce the cotton production on my farm by more than 40 percent. I have watched synthetic fiber production increase and take over my market. I have seen during this period production of cotton in other countries increase more than 10 times because of the protective umbrella we held over price in this country.

At this point in history we will go inevitably in one direction or in another. We shall go in the direction of more comprehensive intervention of Government in the price and marketing of farm products—or we shall seek to reverse the trend and gradually reduce the dependence of farm people upon political management of the farm economy.

The general situation in Washington with respect to farm programs recalls the story about the two boys who so admired a heavyweight boxer that they bet all their money that he would beat the champion.

But their fighter was knocked out in the third round.

"You know," said one of the boys ruefully, "I don't think Sam is as good as he used to be."

"Yeah," replied the other. "And I don't think he ever was."

In the general disillusionment with the panaceas of the past, it is but natural that we should explore new avenues—and perhaps some old or unused avenues.

Someone told me recently, and I am sure it is so because of my own contacts, that farmer opinion is somewhat in a state of flux, that farmers are looking for new answers. I can assure you the same situation prevails on Capitol Hill.

This is all to the good. Such analysis and resurvey is the stuff of which progress is made.

But I hope that all of us, myself included, will look carefully and honestly at the economics and the long-run consequences of any proposal. Will it really help farmers in the long run, or does it involve jumping from the frying pan into the fire?

In the writing of the present farm-program legislation we have written certain definitions or formulas for determining supply, demand, quotas, and the level of price supports. These formulas have not worked too well because no static formula will fit a dynamic, constantly changing economy. Even though the formula is right today, it is wrong tomorrow.

Secretary Benson's answer to this is to eliminate formulas and leave the determination to administrative discretion.

This I cannot buy. It leaves too much authority in the hands of one man. Even though some people might be willing to leave such authority in the hands of the present occupant of the office, no one can know how some future occupant might use or abuse the authority vested in him.

It seems to me that we still have a job to do in finding a way to establish standards by legislative action, particularly as to the level of price support, which contains sufficient recognition of the current market situation to be realistic and workable and yet which avoids the delegation of complete discretion to the—or to any—Secretary of Agriculture.

Among the welter of proposals currently being debated is the question of supporting farm incomes by direct payments to farmers. Such proposals usually involve payments on units of production to bring the total return per unit up to a specified level. And such proposals usually involve an extension of the payment feature to include many other commodities such as livestock, eggs, fruit, vegetables, hogs, in addition to those now supported.

If we are to use the payment approach there is no valid reason to limit price support to a few storable commodities.

A guaranteed return per unit of production would provide a strong incentive for farmers to increase the number of units produced. Financing would be facilitated. The payments themselves would be in part reinvested. The net effect would be to increase capitalization in an industry that is already overcapitalized—to expand the agricultural plant which is already expanded to produce beyond what the market will absorb.

The increased production thus created would move to market at lower prices. The farmer's return from the market would decline; the farmer's return in the form of a payment from Government would increase.

In a recently published study, the Department of Agriculture reached the conclusion that within a few years after the institution of a payment program at 90 percent of parity for all major commodities, the annual cost would run between seven and ten billion dollars per year. In 1957 total net farm income is estimated at \$11.7 billion.

I think their estimate is too low. Regardless of cost, if we go this route, we will make peasants out of every farmer in America.

Unless we are to assume that the general public, through its representatives in Congress, is willing to support unlimited expenditures for agriculture, we must assume that the costs of a payment program would result eventually in the adoption of measures to limit the Government's commitment. Such measures would increase a limitation upon the amount to be paid to any one farmer; or production quotas, or both.

The institution of production quotas of the kind that would be necessary to minimize Government liability, and for the commodities it is proposed be covered by payment programs, would subject agriculture to a degree of centralized control of farm

production and marketing operations far beyond anything heretofore envisaged or dreamed of.

The history of Government programs would indicate that limitations on payments would be invoked at a relatively early state in the program. Note the reduction in the maximum payment under the agricultural conservation program from \$10,000 per farm to \$1,500.

Or in most recent history—when the soil bank program was under consideration, Congress rejected limitations on soil bank payments on the grounds that the purpose of the soil bank was to reduce production of surpluses and the cooperation of the larger producers was needed. Yet, 1 year later, a limitation of \$3,000 for the acreage reserve program was approved.

In any Government program involving the payment of public money to individuals, the inevitable tendency is to work toward a uniform basis—and what is more uniform, more equitable, than an equal payment to each farmer?

So, in a period of a relatively few years it would appear the inevitable consequences of a payment program would be:

1. Increased production.
2. Lower market prices.
3. Farmers would hope to get most of their net income in the form of Government payments.
4. Limitations on the number of dollars each farmer could receive.

The most efficient farm operators would be squeezed between the low market prices induced by guaranteed returns and the limits on the amount that might be paid to any individual.

The result would be a complete dependence of farmers on government, and the leveling off of opportunity in agriculture at a comparatively low level.

Farmers, who would thus become essentially wards of government, could not likely retain the independence and self-reliance that have made farmers the bulwark of responsible self-government.

Personally, I have a higher ambition for those who are and will be farmers.

I do not believe there is any panacea for the income problem in agriculture. Any government that is big enough to give us all we want is also big enough to take all we've got—including our freedom.

I'm sure that you are aware of the rapid decrease in the proportion of farmers to the rest of the population in America. It seems to me as a farmer that we must be stupid if we put our whole dependence and economic welfare into the hands of the Congress or the administrative agencies of government. It is estimated, for example, that by 1975 only 6 percent of the population of America will be producing more than 90 percent of the food and fiber. Are we naive enough to believe that in such a situation that we can continue to pile up huge surpluses of agricultural commodities—let alone think about the Government dipping into the Treasury and paying us at a rate of \$10 to \$15 billion annually.

There are some things that government can do to alleviate the situation. These, government should do. But I think we should be instinctively suspicious of any proposal that leads in the direction of more comprehensive Government direction of and responsibility for the business of producing and marketing farm products. Let us subject such proposals to a most rigorous scrutiny. Let's not jump before we know where we are jumping. Let's be sure we know what the long-run consequences of any proposal may be, before, rather than after, we buy it.

It is a real pleasure to have the opportunity of discussing this subject with you—because I know that what the future holds for agriculture will not be determined by what the present occupants of legislative

chairs may think—but rather by what you and millions of others like you think. Most Members of Congress vote in part in accordance with their personal convictions and in part according to the way they think their constituents want them to vote. Most Congressmen are just average people who have more problems and responsibilities than they know what to do with. Most of them want to do what's right. But they are not much wiser than their constituents urge or permit them to be. As one of my friends tells me, "He has heard the clamorment of the people."

I think, too, I would be remiss, if, while discussing Government's responsibility to agriculture, I did not touch at least briefly upon the reciprocal responsibility of farmers to themselves, to the Government, and to the public generally.

I am sure you would agree with me that farmers need to do a lot more than cast a hopeful eye in the direction of Washington. Farmers have a responsibility as individuals to do what they can to improve their own economic position, to work individually and in their community and through the organizations they have created and which they control, to expand markets and increase the efficiency of production and marketing. They have a responsibility to Government and the general public to call for genuinely helpful action, but to avoid proposals that are impractical, excessive in cost, or harmful to the public. Preservation of your right to take individual, local, and private action is a responsibility of government.

Let me close by expressing my confidence that I am speaking to an audience that is conscious of and dedicated to the great heritage of political and economic principles bequeathed to us—and by confidence that each of you in his own way in his own sphere has the capacity to make a contribution toward finding sound answers consistent with those principles—and that in doing so you will be promoting progress and freedom in America. And it is important that you do so. "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle."

I wish I could recall the name of the man who said, "The conditions upon which God has given liberty to man is eternal vigilance, which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt." In the run of history this quotation is not unrelated to the topic you asked me to discuss.

H. R. 4662, the King-Jenkins Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in a letter sent to the chairman, I have urged members of the House Ways and Means Committee to report favorably H. R. 4662, known as the King-Jenkins bill, so that this important bill may receive early action by the Congress.

H. R. 4662 would permit teachers—including college teachers—to deduct from gross income up to \$600 for tuition, books, other equipment, travel and living expenses while away from home—to the extent that these expenses exceed normal living costs—while pursuing ad-

vanced educational objectives relating to their professional qualifications.

H. R. 4662 and its many companion bills should not be construed as special treatment for teachers. Other professional groups already are permitted to deduct from gross income similar expenses. To deny teachers this equal right is to discourage them from improving their abilities at a time when our Government is proposing vitally important step-ups in our educational system.

Teachers give up their vacations to go to summer school and drive long distances in winter over hazardous roads to attend extension classes because they want to become better teachers. They should be encouraged, not discouraged.

Under present regulations, a teacher cannot deduct these educational expenses unless he would have lost his position had he not taken the courses.

Many teachers and professional groups within my district have written me urging support of H. R. 4662, which I have pledged. I now urge that this bill be reported from committee and passed as soon as possible.

Deducting Amounts Paid for Tuition, Fees, and Books to Certain Public and Private Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, while it is true that the recent sensational scientific and technological advances of the Soviet Government have given point and a much needed sense of urgency to the need for a searching reappraisal of our educational system and the way in which it is tending, and focused renewed emphasis on the sciences, it is my belief that we should be mindful of the overall needs of our educational system lest we forget the fact that democracy such as ours has need for a broad base of aptitudes and skills which must not neglect any field of human endeavor.

With this thought in mind, I have introduced H. R. 9971, which will permit a Federal income-tax deduction for amounts paid to any accredited institution of higher education for tuition, fees, or books in connection with the education at a level above the 12th grade of the taxpayer or for any individual for whom the taxpayer is entitled to claim an exemption.

My bill is unique in that it takes account of, and makes provision for, the education of the taxpayer himself, in addition to those who look to him for their support and education. This is important in two respects. First, it provides an incentive for those many young men and women of our country who because of financial condition of their families must undertake to educate

themselves by hard work and an individual struggle, in short, to support themselves and to acquire an education at the same time, and, second, it will provide a deduction to the taxpayer who is a teacher and who, to the ultimate benefit of the country as a whole and his community in particular, seeks to further his individual skills as a teacher. I am sure that we are all mindful of the fact that the product of our education system can be no better than the skills concentrated in the hands of those who train, guide, and develop the young minds that we entrust to their skills.

The deduction permitted by my bill can be availed of only if the educational institution is an accredited institution which qualifies for deductible contributions under the Internal Revenue Code. The point of so limiting the bill lies in the belief that no useful purpose is served in providing an incentive for matriculation in substandard institutions which ultimately can do harm to the career of a student, and because I believe that recognition should be given to the many contributions made to the American way of life by those nonprofit private and public educational institutions which, without rewards, endeavor to equip and man our Nation to meet the challenges of a constantly changing world.

President Eisenhower's Agricultural Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, although I approve of many of the recommendations contained in President Eisenhower's agricultural message, delivered to the Congress today, I cannot agree that it represents a progress program that can make a substantial contribution to the well-being of America's farm families.

Personally, I want no part of a price-support structure set at 60 to 90 percent of parity. I note that the President has called for flexing price supports downward in order to open the door to market expansion. Mr. Speaker, even if the consumer price for farm production was reduced, I fail to see how the already glutted world market could be expanded. Domestically, figures indicate that the American people, despite rapid population increases, are eating less than ever before; in fact, it would seem, to the point where almost everybody is on a diet.

I question further the wisdom of a more flexible support pattern: How can a farmer produce on the basis of 60 percent of parity when the farm equipment and machinery he buys today is being sold for 160 percent of parity?

It is my opinion that the solution to our farm problems still is to be found in a formula composed of 100 percent of

parity, acreage controls, cross-compliance, and full participation. It is my understanding that there are statutes on the books already which would permit the creation of just such a formula.

The Minority Is Not Always Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult problems a Member of Congress must from time to time face occurs when, after extensive study and objective consideration, he discovers that his convictions on the merits of a vital issue do not accord with the convictions of an overwhelming majority of his colleagues. I am sure that all of the Members of this body have, at one time or another, been beset with agonizing doubts when what appears to be essential truths demand that you counter the popular trend.

I found myself in just such a situation in 1952, during the consideration by the 82d Congress of fair trade legislation. In this instance, however, evidence in the subsequent 6 short years, clearly demonstrate that what was then contrary to the majority and the popular stand nevertheless was right. I am gratified that in State after State the courts are ruling that so-called fair trade is contrary to fundamental guarantees of American society. Their decisions underscore the validity of objections to Federal enabling legislation for resale price maintenance, a pernicious system of price fixing which is contrary to basic American competitive and contractual concepts.

You all recall the situation that existed in 1952. By that time, advocates of fair trade had secured enactment in 45 States of laws prohibiting deviations from prices that had been established by a manufacturer for his trademarked goods. Those laws prohibited price deviations, not only by those who had by contract agreed with the manufacturer to maintain resale prices, but also, in the infamous nonsigner clauses, prohibited deviations by those who had never agreed to maintain resale prices and who might not even have knowledge of such a contract.

The United States Supreme Court in 1951 in the Schwegmann case effectively emasculated fair trade and the burden it imposes on interstate commerce in its ruling that prices set by manufacturers were not enforceable against nonsigners. Immediately fair trade advocates introduced bills to overrule the Supreme Court's temperate and wise decision.

Certain of these bills were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I was then chairman. Other bills were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Both committees held exhaustive hearings on all phases of this problem, and both com-

mittees reported out bills to overrule the Supreme Court and to reinstate fair trade.

Only three members of the Judiciary Committee, of which I was one, signed the minority report—House Report No. 1516—in opposition to fair trade. The report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—House Report No. 1437—contains no minority views in opposition to resale price maintenance. Subsequent action in the House was equally one sided. On May 8, 1952, by a vote of 196 to 10, the House after vigorous debate, adopted the McGuire bill that had been recommended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

In both the Judiciary Committee's minority report in opposition to resale price maintenance and on the floor of the House, I opposed fair trade on a number of grounds. Extensive evidence was marshaled to show the history of fair trade included the following results:

It promotes concentration of economic power.

It injures the competitive status of independent retailers.

It fosters violations of the antitrust laws.

It is unfair to the consumer.

The nonsigner clause that makes a man responsible for the terms of a contract he did not sign, and of which he has no knowledge, and which he does not approve, offends treasured principles of American ethics and is contrary to the entire system of commercial law that is the fabric of our economic well-being. Subsequent events have sustained these arguments. Whereas in 1952, 45 States had fair-trade legislation, today only 31 State fair-trade laws are undisturbed by the State judiciaries. In two States, Virginia and Nebraska, the courts have voided their entire Fair Trade Acts. In 12 other States, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina and Utah, the courts have voided the State laws as to nonsigners and thereby have rendered fair trade in those States virtually ineffective. I am confident that, as time goes on, the complete elimination of fair-trade price fixing will demonstrate the historical truism that time converts many a minority position into the majority one.

Presentation of Cordell Hull Award for Leadership in Building United States Foreign Economic Policy to the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, much has already been said by some of my colleagues about the presentation of the Cordell Hull Award for Leadership

in Building United States Foreign Economic Policy to the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce on December 10, 1957, by the Committee on Foreign Trade Education.

At the request of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that a message sent to the award meeting by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, together with one I sent, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE MESSAGE OF THE HONORABLE ADLAI E. STEVENSON, DECEMBER 10, 1957

I have long been a supporter of the reciprocal trade agreements program and I intend to do all in my power to see that this program is renewed and liberalized when it comes before Congress early next year. I think an intensive effort must be made to explain to Congress and to the country precisely why it is in the national interest that this program be extended. And I am sure that the administration will have the support of many leading citizens and voluntary organizations on a nonpartisan basis provided it is prepared to lead the way and stay on the course.

EXCERPT FROM THE MESSAGE OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, UNITED STATES SENATOR, DECEMBER 6, 1957

You are certainly right about the growing threat to our reciprocal trade program, and the urgent need for greater effort to stimulate public understanding as to our stake in foreign trade. Perhaps no issue before the coming Congress will be of more importance to our future, yet it will be difficult to mobilize the support we need for a realistic trade program unless the public can be awakened to how closely it is linked with successful international relations.

It seems to me that the American business community can and must accept this challenge of asserting some vigorous leadership toward public education in the direction of expanded foreign trade and strengthened foreign economic policy, putting aside short-term self-interest where necessary in the realization that all of us have a tremendous stake in the long-range goal of building a more secure world and more peaceful society in which all humanity can enjoy the blessings of progress and improved economic conditions.

Rollcall for Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of the principal address at the annual dinner of the National Reclamation Association at Phoenix, Ariz., on November 7, 1957, which was delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is entitled "Rollcall for Reclamation."

The attention of the Senate is invited to this masterful, factual presentation of the situation confronting the Nation, and particularly the West, with respect

to the reclamation program as a result of the financial policies of the present administration, especially regarding the urgent need for a reappraisal of the program and policies.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a former Secretary of Agriculture before coming to the Senate, is now the able chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee and senior majority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He is also a former Member of the House of Representatives.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] gave the Reclamation Association and the country facts that must be taken to heart if the economic stability of the Nation and the West is to be maintained. He warned of the threats to the ability of the United States in the not too distant future to provide food for its rapidly expanding population. He pointed out that had the current high interest policies of the Eisenhower administration for reclamation projects been in effect earlier, the Nation would be without many great conservation and multiple-purpose reclamation projects, producing water for irrigation, hydroelectric power, flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife protection.

I considered the ANDERSON speech of such high value to the country that I asked the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his permission to have his presentation printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is vital that the country be alerted to the problems that confront reclamation.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLLCALL FOR RECLAMATION

(Address by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON)

Six hundred years ago, the Hohokam Indians irrigated their crops in the Salt River Valley, perhaps on this very spot.

Four hundred years ago, Francisco Vasquez de Coronado followed the San Pedro River, then a broad, fast-flowing stream and now a dry stretch of dust, into the Southwest in search of the seven cities of Cibola. He was led on by the story that the walls of the houses were formed of pure gold, but when he came to Hawikuh, he learned to his early disappointment and eventual despair that what Fray Marcos de Niza took to be gold was only corn shining in the blaze of a desert sun.

Like the conquistador of four centuries ago, the modern seeker of agricultural wealth has heard of the riches that pour forth from acres reclaimed from the desert by giant dams behind which are stored the waters of winter snows and summer rains. One by one these dams dot the landscape, while below and beyond them, new farms blossom with food and fiber. The pattern has been much the same: High dams to provide a strong head of water which can be released through whirling turbines to generate the white gold of electricity—the breadwinner for the irrigation of the fields.

REAPPRAISAL OF RECLAMATION

But there may be a new rollcall of reclamation—a reappraisal of possibilities. The white gold of a decade ago may not settle to the bottom of our prospector's pan. Higher construction indexes, reduced agricultural prices, and spiraling interest costs may com-

bine to end for a time the successful search for feasible reclamation projects. It is this unwelcome prospect that I would discuss with you tonight.

May we take it for granted that there are a dozen interesting excursions into history that we might make before we talk about our present problem.

There was the West of the Indian when the beavers were the persistent builders of dams and the chief contributors to conservation by slowing down the rate of early spring runoff.

There was the West of Kit Carson, Bill Williams and Jedediah Smith where only the occasional traveler would disturb the prairie dogs or watch the whirlwinds of dust.

There was the West that General Kearney claimed from Mexico and out of which was carved this State and my own. The general found beautiful irrigated valleys, but there were no elaborate engineering works—merely brush dams built into the stream by the Spanish don who owned the land from the river to the hills. There was no need of soil analysis, no study of stream aggradation, no bonded debt. The water served only the acres where the simple ditch would carry it. Thus it had been flowing for a century across the fields of what I now call my farm before Kearney came into the valley of the Rio Grande.

But the turn of the century saw the picture changing. The railroad had hurried the development of centers from which cattle and ore could be shipped, and these had turned into towns or were becoming cities. The vast stretch of pasture was not enough; the diversification of crops was started. Farming on irrigated land became more of a task than the individual could handle, so there were formed associations of water users aided by the lawyer and the banker from a nearby town. Private finance was too limited; farm prices were too low. Thus, by 1900, men were looking to the Government for help.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT ON RECLAMATION

President Theodore Roosevelt in 1901 sent a special message to the Congress. In it were these words:

"The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country just as the settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States."

Then he stated the case for the West:

"It is as right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by engineering works for the storage of water as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid regions by engineering works of another character."

During the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt the Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed. It provided a 10-year repayment period for irrigation works. At that time, the generation of power was not considered in arriving at project feasibility. Those who used the water—the farmers, ranchers, and orchardmen—would pay the bill and pay it quickly.

REPAYMENT PERIOD EXTENDED

Twelve years later, after it became apparent that the 10-year period was too short, the Extension Act of 1914 stretched the repayment period to 20 years. Another 12 years demonstrated that still more time would be required, and in 1926 the Fact Finders Act extended the repayment period to 40 years. At the end of another 10 years it was necessary to stretch the repayment period to 50 years by adding a development period of 10 years ahead of the 40-year repayment program. Congress was trying to keep step with the growing cost of making land and the increasing problem of paying installments as they came due.

For our purposes tonight, we need not review the early sources of financing. There has been a reclamation fund, supplemented

by Treasury loans, by revenues from the Oil and Mineral Leasing Acts and some other sources including repayments from the water users.

SALT RIVER VALLEY PROJECT AND PUBLIC POWER

Of more interest to us is the 1906 change in the revenue picture—by coincidence brought about by the situation in this Salt River Valley.

During the construction of Roosevelt Dam it was found that electric energy was needed to operate construction machinery. So a very small hydropower plant was built. When the dam was completed the Government found that it had power to sell.

During the period, 1906 to 1922, the Government sold the power on a lease basis of up to 10 years. In 1922, the lease period was extended to 50 years. The extension probably is the basis for the present 50-year payout test for feasibility of reclamation power installations.

At any rate, as the realization grew that construction and operating costs of irrigation projects exceeded the ability of water users to repay, more and more attention was being shifted to the hydropower phases of proposed projects.

FACT FINDERS REPORT

In addition, a group known as the Fact Finders, under the chairmanship of the late Governor Campbell, of Arizona, succeeded in establishing a rigid land classification system which eliminated many bad projects. At first, reclamation advocates had assumed that almost any combination of land and water would produce crops. But a shrinking in total irrigable acres as a result of the land classifications threw an increased per-acre project cost upon the remaining irrigated acres. Farming, already unable to cope with the financial aspects of the projects, was being further penalized and power was called in to make up the deficit.

Other factors came along to add to the troubles. In the 1940's it was admitted that the cost of drainage facilities must be included in estimating total project costs. This meant that still more projects had to be rejected.

POWER REVENUES AID IRRIGATION

Then a sixfold rise in construction costs struck another blow to projects dependent upon water users for repayment. The undertakings became so enormously expensive that every remaining irrigation proposal in the West became automatically unfeasible if revenues from hydropower were unavailable.

During the period we have been reviewing, Hoover Dam, the first major reclamation power development, was authorized. Feasibility of the project hinged on obtaining power contracts prior to start of construction. The contracts were to be in sufficient amount to repay the cost of the structure within the 50-year period. The authorizing legislation made a further provision—no costs of the dam were to be allocated to the release of water for irrigation purposes, although such water was given high priority in the operation of the project.

So we had two contrasts by the mid-1930's: Irrigation works alone were pretty largely a failure. Power structures, though, seemed to be endowed with a golden future, even with irrigation as a partner.

IRRIGATION-POWER ASPECTS MERGED

It was but a matter of time until the irrigation-power aspects of the reclamation program were being merged deliberately.

Perhaps the first such effort involved the Central Valley project in California. Here roughly one-fourth of the costs of this giant irrigation system are to be repaid from power revenues.

Having taken this step, Congress in 1938 authorized the Colorado Big Thompson project, limiting repayable costs by water users to 28.7 percent and providing that the bal-

ance of the Federal outlay would be reimbursed through the sale of power.

The following year, 1939, the Columbia Basin project, the largest multiple-purpose project ever undertaken anywhere, was authorized and more than 84 percent of the cost will be reimbursed by power sales.

The Missouri River Basin project, another large undertaking, requires irrigators to repay only one-fifth of the irrigation costs. On the upper Colorado River storage project the irrigation repayment requirement drops to 13.5 percent.

POWER ASPECTS WELL ESTABLISHED

Thus, the power-generation aspect of the reclamation program has become well established. If time could stand still, the remainder of the reclamation and irrigation program might be patterned after these multiple-purpose prototypes.

But time does not stand still. Just when we had found—in power—the solution to the problem of how to irrigate the desert, three new factors intruded to make difficult if not impossible the scheduling of future irrigation construction. They were: The higher cost of construction, the higher cost of money, and the postwar drop in agricultural prices. Since power from falling water is the real breadwinner and must pay four-fifths to seven-eighths of the total cost, the interest charged on the amount allocated to power holds the key to the future of all your dreams.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Suppose we call the roll of reclamation prospects and examine our future case by case.

To me, no area development is more important than the upper Colorado River storage project. Under general reclamation law, most reclamation projects pay 3 percent interest on the portion of cost allocated to power. REA gets money at 2 percent, but reclamation is expected to pay 3 percent. Why, I don't know; but the upper Colorado project is on a still different basis.

Senate bill 1555 of the 83d Congress was introduced to authorize the project. In section 2 it provided that:

"Interest on the unamortized balance of the investment in the commercial power features of the said project shall be returnable at a rate not less than the average rate paid by the United States on its long term bonds outstanding at the date of authorization of the project."

INTEREST RATE ESTABLISHED BY LAW

On April 1, 1954, the then Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, sent a draft bill covering changes in S. 1555 desired by his department and the Bureau of the Budget. That draft provided for repayment of unamortized balances at a rate—and I quote now from paragraph (e) of section 4:

"To be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year for which said appropriation is enacted, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent."

The intent of that language was incorporated into the version of S. 1555 reported to the 83d Congress. The provision as reported was carried forward in S. 500 of the 84th Congress and became the provision of Public Law 485 of the 84th Congress. I include the language again to make the reference

complete. It is in paragraph (f) of section 5, as follows:

"(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public-debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum."

EFFECT OF CHANGE IN INTEREST RATE

What is the effect of changing from interest rate to market yield on long-term Government bonds? The bill was signed into law April 11, 1956, and the first money for Glen Canyon was made available. The market yield on long-term bonds during the month of June 1956 was 2½ percent. If appropriations had not been promptly sought and received, the interest charge against Glen Canyon would have been pegged at the rate effective during June of 1957 which was 3½ percent. That difference in rate would apply to any participating project started in fiscal 1958 and could be the difference in determining whether such a project would ever pay out and hence whether an appropriation to commence it would ever be justified.

We could have less concern if the project was being asked to pay what money costs the Government. On August 13, 1957, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Randolph Burgess, sent me a letter in reply to mine of August 3 showing that while the average rate on the interest-bearing debt as of July 31, 1956, was 2.605 percent and as of July 1, 1957, was 2.742 percent, the rate applicable to any participating project started after July 1, 1957, or during fiscal 1958 will be 3½ percent. I will attach to my address a table illustrating that fact. It is from a technical analysis of the public debt released by the Treasury Department July 1957.

Now what is the effect of a 3½ percent interest rate? And what will happen to other projects if their costs continue to climb and they have to be started under 3½ percent rate? Let's look again at Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams. Interest against them is charged at the average yield of long term bonds on June 30, 1956, which was 2½ percent. At that rate these projects will pay out in 47 years. If there had been 1 year's delay either in passing the authorizing legislation on the original upper Colorado River storage bill or the appropriation to start work on the dams, the interest rate would rise to 3½ percent and 80 years would have been required to pay out these 2 structures.

POWER COSTS ASSURED FIRST

Now the Colorado River storage project law requires that the power costs of these dams must be assured before any funds can become available from the sale of power to pay for the irrigation works associated with them under the act. Therefore, if 1 more year had intervened, money for participating projects would have been scheduled not in 47 years but in 80 years.

The Congress has many times had before it the central Arizona project including the Bridge Canyon Dam. Suppose the Congress were to authorize it the first day of the next session and the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House checked into its feasibility. A letter from Mr. Dexheimer, dated August 23, 1957, points out that at present prices the estimated cost allocable to power

at Bridge Canyon is about \$340,600,000. If we used the same annual gross revenues of \$11,880,000 estimated in House Document No. 136 of the 81st Congress and estimated net annual revenues of \$7,586,000, the project can look feasible if money is cheap, but at 3 percent interest which would be effective during fiscal year 1958, the average annual cost would be \$19,146,000 and interest only would be \$12,347,000 or nearly \$5 million more than the net annual revenues from the Bridge Canyon project.

TRINITY PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Let's continue our rollcall of reclamation projects by taking a look at the Central Valley project in California, with the Trinity division. If expenditures to date on that project were indexed to reflect January 1957 costs, the total estimated construction cost, if undertaken at present prices, would increase about 27 percent. If that project had had to be constructed at these higher costs and at an interest rate of 3 percent, the rough studies made by the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that payout of the increased costs allocable to the power investment plus interest during construction would not have been possible since the annual net power revenues would be approximately \$10,482,000 and would not be sufficient to meet the necessary annual interest charges.

Suppose we want to see what happens if we wanted to make a project of this nature feasible. The Bureau of Reclamation has computed that to achieve payout of the power investment in a 50-year period at an interest rate of 3 percent, the annual net power revenues would have to be increased to about \$18,300,000. Average firm power rates of about 7.6 mills per kilowatt-hour would be required to produce such annual net revenues. The present revenues from firm commercial energy average 4.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

I do not say that current could not be marketable at 7.6 mills. I do say that to change the firm commercial energy average rate from 4.5 mills to 7.6 mills would cause something in the nature of a revolution.

EFFECT ON MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT

The Missouri River Basin project at 3 percent interest can pay off in 61 years, but at 3 percent it could never pay off because the interest costs on the power facilities exceed the net revenues.

The Colorado Big Thompson project will pay out in 41 years at 3 percent. But it would require 74 years at 3 percent. If the rate should go to 4 percent, as some bankers think it will by next June 30 and if that rate were to be applied to it, the Colorado Big Thompson project could not pay out at all.

I have mentioned Hoover Dam, which will pay out within the 50-year limitation at the present 3 percent interest and existing power rates, but it would never pay out at 3 percent since interest costs would exceed power revenues.

I have not mentioned the Columbia Basin project (Grand Coulee Dam) up to this point for a special reason. Power generated there is sold through the Bonneville Power Administration to be mixed with other power in the region. The arrangement is such that the Bonneville agency pays whatever the cost of the power may be. Even though Grand Coulee power may be very costly, the impact of its cost can be lessened when it is mingled with lower cost power if that need ever arises.

However, not even the Grand Coulee powerplant could have been expected to pay out at 3 percent interest.

NEW PROJECTS FACE PROBLEMS

I have reviewed these projects well known to all of us to indicate the difficulty there will be in trying to put through additional reclamation projects when the Nation requires

more food and fiber. Most of the great projects we have built in the past—Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee powerplant, whose projects on the Missouri Basin—would have been difficult if not impossible had the 3 percent interest rate been applicable for the repayment of costs allocated to power. If we believe, as I am sure we do, that construction costs are going to continue to advance and that more and more reclamation projects will depend upon power revenues to bring irrigation costs within the capacity of farmers to repay, then we must recognize that if reclamation is to go on, the interest charge must come down, at least to a flat 3 percent figure and possibly lower.

The questions we are likely to be asked are: Do we need more irrigation? Do we need to develop more farmland when the Department of Agriculture is paying to have farmland taken out of cultivation and put into a soil bank?

IRRIGATION QUESTIONS ANSWERED

Two and a half years ago, actually April 19, 1955, in an address to the Senate of the United States on the subject "Reclamation—Food for the Future," I tried to answer these questions. I asserted that the population of the United States was on the loose, that we were having what I termed "a great baby boom." I tried to calculate how long it would take for our increasing population and our shrinking farmland to catch up fully with the then surplus production of food and fiber.

Tonight the population figures could be brought up to date. In my Senate talk, I had quoted the experts who estimated a 1975 population of 175 million persons. Against that I had given another estimate that went as high as 190 million persons. The U. S. News & World Report for October 4, 1957, gave the surprising figures that in 1957 there were 171 million people in the United States and that by 1967 there would be 202 million persons. In other words, by 1957 we had reached the population figure of 171 million, whereas the rather conservative figures which I had used only 2 years before had estimated a 1975 population of 175 million people.

GREAT POPULATION INCREASE FORECAST

The Census Bureau, according to Business Week of August 31, 1957, sees a 57.6 million increase in population by 1970. Add that to 171 million now and we can foresee a population of about 230 million. With the West as the fastest growing area, the need for many new reclamation projects to keep pace with rising population is now being demonstrated.

With the need for more irrigated acres easy to demonstrate and with money rates making project feasibility harder and harder to establish, the friends of reclamation must be ready to battle for their cause in the next Congress.

For there are enemies abroad in the land. The Wall Street Journal, in an article on August 19 and an editorial on August 23 last, took a double-barrel shot at reclamation. Their story by Ray Vicker said that one bureau of our Government—Reclamation—was planning to bring in 150,700 acres of new cropland and add supplementary water to another 93,000 acres, while a different agency—the Department of Agriculture—tabulated the farmland idled by the soil bank at 28.4 million acres. Mr. Vicker wondered why one agency is bringing new land into production while another is taking it out.

It is a fair question that we must meet and answer. Of course, I go into a barber shop and pay a barber to cut my hair and then give him an extra half dollar to rub into my scalp a tonic to make it grow again. Each spring and fall I put fertilizer on my lawn to make the grass grow higher and then go around with a power mower to cut it down. This, in the language of the Wall

Street Journal editorial, is "fantastic and a bureaucratic extravaganza."

But the cold, hard facts are not fantastic. Abe Martin used to say, "It is funny how a man with facts can break up an argument." Before I made any claim that the increase in production per acre would not and could not keep pace with the steady decline in cropland and the amazing boom in population, I consulted the Department of Agriculture, where I am not entirely a stranger.

NEED FOR IRRIGATION FORECAST

The Department in a letter to me last September 24 dealt with this question. It anticipated a population of 230 million by 1975. Its studies indicated that with high level employment we might experience a 40-percent increase in market demand from 1955 to 1975. "While we now have overproduction and burdensome surpluses of agricultural products, total output," says the Department, "seems to be at an annual rate equal to that which may be needed 4 or 5 years hence." No irrigation project approved in 1956 or later can possibly be in a state of production by that time to cause any worry over its possible contribution to an already swollen agriculture storehouse.

The careful studies of the Department, giving full credibility to presently known improvements and later results of new research, indicate that there will be a need for new cropland. The production per acre index shows this. In 1942 the index stands at 100 and by 1954 it was only 101. The great increases in production per acre are behind us. The first use of hybrid corn, the first lavish spreading of high-powered fertilizer shot the index up 25 percent in a few years; but these days are over now and we are not likely to see any equivalent new force even from atomic development.

I look at the prospect of 3 million new mouths to be fed in America every year. I look at a million acres of cropland being lost to shopping centers, highways, and airports every year. I then draw but a single conclusion: our fight must be intensified; pending projects must be approved; new projects must come off the drawing boards and go before the Congress for ultimate approval; reclamation must go on.

Designation of Alexander Hamilton Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, I am happy to report that at ceremonies on the south plaza of the Treasury Building, on last Saturday—the 201st anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton—the short street south of that building, formerly known as Treasury Place, was officially designated by its new name, Alexander Hamilton Place.

I feel that the naming of a street in our National Capital after our first Secretary of the Treasury, who contributed perhaps more than any other single American to the development and adoption of our cherished American Constitution, is highly appropriate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

the addresses delivered on that occasion by Fred C. Scribner, Jr., the Under Secretary of the Treasury; by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; and by me.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUNDT

Today we ring down the curtain on the year-long observance of Alexander Hamilton's bicentennial. In recommending the establishment of an Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission the Judiciary Committee had this to say in its report to the Senate:

"The Commission shall have the duty of preparing plans and a program for signaling the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton.

"Alexander Hamilton was born on the island of Nevis in the British West Indies on January 11, 1757. It was in the American Revolution that Alexander Hamilton stood with Washington and Franklin in developing the basis of what is today our great Federal Republic. Hamilton was the fertile mind and organizing genius of President Washington's administrations. For this great work he has been described as the architect of the American Union. Hamilton represented the conservative mind in its most brilliant and useful form. His devotion to the free press, to free speech, and to the institutions of freemen is too little appreciated. The finest monument that could be erected would be an adequate edition of his writings. Such an edition would not be merely a monument to Hamilton—it would be a genuine and enduring contribution to the Nation which he labored so ardently to create. The committee is of the opinion that the works of Hamilton would be particularly appropriate in this era of world history, when so many countries throughout the world are struggling with the problem of self-government or trying to find a proper formula to use in adopting for themselves the self-government best suited to their environment, capabilities, and abilities, and the making available to those people the complete works of Alexander Hamilton will serve not only this Republic, but the world."

I am happy to tell you that this monument is being erected with private funds. Columbia University has received an initial grant of \$200,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation and Time, Inc., to edit and publish The Papers of Alexander Hamilton. This work is in the hands of a distinguished editorial board headed by Dr. John A. Krout, vice president and provost of Columbia University and a member of the Hamilton commission. The editor is Dr. Harold C. Syrett and the assistant editor is Jacob E. Cooke. The Hamilton commission has aided this project by a worldwide search for letters and documents that had long been lost or hidden from view.

The commission's approach has been to stimulate others into activity and to guide their efforts. In this we have had considerable success. A large one-volume edition of Hamilton's writings was published by Dial Press. Somewhat abbreviated, this same work was published by Pocket Books, and sells for 35 cents. A one-volume biography was published by McGraw-Hill; and the first volume of a two-volume biography has been published by Macmillan. The Liberal Arts Press has published two Hamilton books, each in cloth and in paper covers—mainly for students.

The commission also developed programs for the high schools and for the colleges and universities. Many of the latter had special lectures on Hamilton, emphasized his work in history and government classes and seminars, and had library exhibits. In the high

schools contests were held for Alexander Hamilton scholarships—one in each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia. The 55 winners were brought to Independence Hall in Philadelphia to take part in a 4-day students constitutional convention where 13 national winners were selected for additional scholarships. This entire scholarship program was financed by private funds which were raised by a special committee headed by Frederick C. Crawford, of Cleveland, Ohio.

These are but some of the Hamilton commission's achievements. Together with others, which I do not have time to describe, we believe we have contributed much to a better understanding of Alexander Hamilton's great work in getting the Constitution written, in getting it ratified, and in getting the Federal Government organized under that instrument of government under which we live today.

In closing the year-long observance of Hamilton's bicentennial, I am happy to announce that, at the commission's request, the National Park Service will change the name of the street on which the Treasury Building faces from Treasury Place to Alexander Hamilton Place.

This will be a fitting tribute to the man who, more than any other, thought out the Constitution of the United States and the Government of the Union organized under it; and, out of the chaos and utter confusion after the Revolution, raised a structure of government, every part of which is imbued with his ideas and principles. These ideas and principles—the eternal truths of government—have, we hope, become better known and understood through the efforts of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

I now read you the letter from Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton designating the re-naming of Treasury Place as Alexander Hamilton Place:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1958.
HON. KARL MUNDT,
Chairman, Alexander Hamilton
Bicentennial Commission,
4026 Main Treasury Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: With further reference to your very fine suggestion of December 23, 1957, on behalf of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, recommending the change of the name of Treasury Place—which runs between 15th Street and Executive Avenue East—to Alexander Hamilton Place, I am glad to inform you that we feel the suggestion is a very worthy one. It is hereby approved.

We have made no announcement of this change as we feel it would be only fitting that the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission make the announcement in such manner and at such time as they may wish.

With kind regards,
Sincerely yours,

FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON ADDRESS BY
SENATOR SALTONSTALL

My home State of Massachusetts has a special interest in Alexander Hamilton. It was at the port of Boston that young Hamilton landed in October of 1772 when he came to the mainland for his education and, as it turned out, to make a permanent home. And it was after a trip to Boston in early 1774 that he returned to New York convinced of the righteousness of the colonial cause, so convinced that he promptly began writing and speaking in behalf of freedom.

In reflecting on the achievements of Alexander Hamilton, it is impossible to escape recognition of the great contribution which

he made to our Nation in its infancy. He has left his imprint in the institutions of our Government and in the philosophies and ideals by which we work. As our first Secretary of the Treasury, his policies and actions laid vital blocks in the foundation upon which our Federal Government and our Nation has grown. His strong belief in a federalized nation and in a strong Central Government were of immense importance in bringing together the resources of our Nation for a common purpose. Even today, although we retain the sovereignty of our States, we realize more and more the fundamental importance of what he told us—the necessity for fiscal integrity—the necessity for a Federal Government with the power to marshal the resources of this vast country, of ever-increasing importance in the missile age we are now entering.

Though we look with great pride to these significant achievements and contributions, we should by no means overlook the brilliance of his military career. In 1776 he commanded a New York artillery company which he had equipped largely from his own resources. He fought with General Washington in the battles of New York and across New Jersey. From 1777 to 1881 he served on General Washington's staff. Not only did he perform many sensitive and delicate missions for Washington, but he won great distinction on the battlefield.

In fact, in Yorktown in 1781 Hamilton led the final American charge, capturing the vital position that brought about the surrender of Cornwallis.

As a Member of the Continental Congress, Hamilton worked in behalf of the young Republic. He did much to bring about the Annapolis Convention which, in turn, led to the calling of the Constitutional Convention in 1787. At this Convention as New York's delegate, he vigorously worked for a strong and stable government. The Federalist Papers which he wrote in collaboration with James Madison and John Jay still are among the most important documents in amplification of the formation of the Constitution of the United States.

Throughout his life Hamilton maintained an intense interest in military affairs. He was the first advocate of a national military academy for officer corps training. Not only did he draft a detailed curriculum for such an institute, but in mid-1799 he formally recommended to President Washington the establishment of a naval academy. Though Washington, just before his death, strongly endorsed this project it was some years before Congress established first the Military and later the Naval Academies. Hamilton instituted the United States Coast Guard, always an arm of the Treasury.

In 1798 he rejected a United States Senate seat to serve as a major general in the Army. He was in command of all our military forces north of the Potomac, in the Northwest, and along the Mississippi. Upon Washington's death, Hamilton became the commanding general of the United States Army. He worked unceasingly to strengthen the Armed Forces and our coastal defenses. When the danger of war with France subsided, he made a final inspection tour that satisfied him that our defenses had been greatly strengthened. He then resigned his military command.

Our country and its government owe much to this great soldier, this creative, foresighted statesman, able author, and loyal patriotic citizen. We honor his memory with gratitude for what he did for us and with pride in his accomplishments.

ADDRESS BY HON. FRED C. SCRIBNER, JR., UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT CEREMONIES MARKING CLOSING OF THE HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL

Mr. Gordon, President Platt, Senators Mundt, Saltonstall, fellow Americans, this

morning's ceremony marks the 201st anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton the first Secretary of the Treasury. It is also the concluding ceremony of the year-long observance of the 200th anniversary of Hamilton's birthday, a program planned and directed with great effectiveness by the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission under the chairmanship of Senator MUNDT.

It is a privilege and honor for me, as a representative of the Treasury Department, to join in this ceremony sponsored by one of our great national patriotic organizations, the Sons of the Revolution.

Americans are busy people. We are vitally concerned with the present and the future. Because of these concerns, we are as a nation frequently remiss in honoring the great men of past generations whose leadership and abilities have contributed so much to the strength and character of our country. We should more frequently pause in our daily tasks to note and learn from the works of those who provided leadership during the early days of this Nation. Through knowledge of the challenges met by these leaders and through study of their contributions, we would find inspiration and strength as we seek solutions for the problems and concerns which are ours today.

The Sons of the Revolution, by this ceremony, participated in by representatives of the Armed Forces, the church and two of the most distinguished Members of the Senate of the United States, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, speak the gratitude and appreciation of all of the people of this country as we pause for a few brief moments this morning to place a wreath on this statue of Hamilton which stands here before the Treasury and in sight of the Capitol and the White House.

As a young man of 32, Alexander Hamilton became the first Secretary of the Treasury. He had been a bold and vigorous military leader in the Revolution. As a Representative of the State of New York, he had participated in the Constitutional Convention. Upon the completion of the drafting of the Constitution, he led a vigorous campaign to secure its ratification by his State. He was the leader of the Federalist group which in the New York ratifying convention secured approval of the Constitution by three votes. His voice and his pen were mighty forces in securing the acceptance by the young Nation of the Constitution which became the charter of our great country.

When Alexander Hamilton took office as Secretary of the Treasury, there was no public credit. Hamilton created it. It was he who insisted on funding the national debt and planned the creation of a sinking fund to satisfy the Government's bonds as they became due. It was he who insisted that certain obligations incurred by the States in the cause of the Union should be paid by the new Central Government. The credit of the new Government became firmly established under Hamilton's careful planning.

Each day in the Treasury we honor Alexander Hamilton. His portrait occupies a place of honor in the private office of the Secretary. We honor Hamilton by following in many areas programs and practices which he instituted so many years ago. We honor him through the continuation in the Treasury of many of the functions of the department which he wisely established in the first days of the Treasury's existence. He conceived and organized the United States Coast Guard to help enforce our customs laws and protect the revenue, and this fine service remains to this day under Treasury jurisdiction. He established the United States Mint. He organized under the Treasury a hospital for seamen, which developed into the United States Public Health Service, now in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

But Hamilton's real greatness lies in the contribution which he made in giving life and vitality to a paper Constitution. We can agree with Dean Louis Hacker in his estimate of Hamilton:

"A theoretical frame of government is one thing; the creation of an administrative machinery under which such high hopes can be translated into reality is another. This latter was Hamilton's accomplishment; and that is why, when men gather to reflect on the governmental process, which, with justice, can maintain order and yet encourage the individual in the full play of his creative powers to reflect, work, and produce, they must honor Alexander Hamilton."

We cannot, however, sum up Hamilton's contribution in the Treasury better than was done by Henry Cabot Lodge in his study of Alexander Hamilton, when he said, "Hamilton exercised the powers granted by the Constitution, pointed out those which lay hidden in its dry clauses, and gave vitality to the lifeless instrument. He drew out the resources of the country, he exercised the powers of the Constitution, he gave courage to the people, he laid the foundations of the National Government—and this was the meaning and result of the financial policy."

It is entirely fitting that the close of the very successful Hamilton bicentennial should be observed here today under the auspices of the Sons of the Revolution and with the participation of the Bicentennial Commission. Both have added materially to public awareness and knowledge of one of our great national leaders. Hamilton's greatness lives on in the Treasury and in the Nation.

The Splendid Role of Educational Television and of Station WHA-TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, education has always been important in America, from the days of the frontier settlements in the Thirteen Colonies, through modern times. But today, in the age of sputnik and intercontinental missiles, in the age of the United Nations and the World Atomic Energy Agency, education is more of a necessity than ever before in our history. I mean education in right ideas, as well as in machines, education in the intangibles as well as the tangibles.

Inevitably, the American people are taking a close look at their educational system. They seek to determine its strength and its weaknesses, in order to better serve the needs of our country and of our youngsters themselves.

Even the wearers of rose-colored glasses would admit that there are a good many things wrong with American education, but there is plenty that is right and constructive and wholesome in American education, as well.

It is our task to build upon the solid foundations which have already been laid by the devoted teaching profession in our land, and by parents, as well. One such solid foundation is the miracle medium of educational television. It is a part of the broader foundation of in-

creased overall use of audio-visual materials.

This represents one of the most exciting new chapters in the history of United States education. In particular, the growing use of television has emerged as one of the most distinguishing characteristics on the American teaching scene.

Illustrative of this situation, I have been pleased to prepare a statement on the subject of the splendid role which one educational television station plays—the fifth such educational TV station to go on the air in the Nation—the award-winning station, WHA-TV, Madison. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

A deep interest in communications has long been a distinguishing characteristic of the people of Wisconsin and of their State university.

It is no accident that WHA, Madison, the University of Wisconsin's radio station, enjoys the title of "The Oldest Station in the Nation." It had its origins in experimental "wireless telephone" transmissions over station 9-XM in 1917, followed by scheduled program service which began in 1919.

The Wisconsin School of the Air, founded in 1931, is the oldest continuing broadcast service on a statewide basis. It provides programs in creative art, music, science, nature study, history, language, arts and other subjects, to add to, and enrich, classroom teaching in elementary schools.

Since September, 1933, station WHA has provided, as well, organized, systematic instruction at the college level through the College of the Air.

In 1945, came the development of a State FM radio network to augment and extend the services of station WHA. The 8 FM stations, as well as station WLBL, the AM outlet in the central part of the State, are operated by the State Radio Council.

BIRTH OF EDUCATIONAL TV IN MADISON

Inevitably, with the onset of television, Wisconsin pioneering, once more, came to the fore. A closed-circuit TV laboratory was provided in the university in 1952. In 1953, the far-sighted Wisconsin legislature authorized the university and the other agencies of the State Radio Council to construct and operate an experimental television station. This action paved the way for the establishment of WHA-TV. On May 3, 1954, it began programmed operations.

In the almost 4 years which have elapsed, station WHA-TV has provided some of the brightest chapters in nationwide educational television.

As elsewhere, the record has not been without its problems—birth pains and growing pains, financial and otherwise.

Taxpayer controversy has raged over the question of the further extent to which public funds should be used in educational television in Wisconsin or, for that matter, the rest of the Nation.

But the solid record of achievement of WHA-TV speaks for itself in terms of tremendous contributions to all phases of Wisconsin life.

We have, indeed, been fortunate in the high caliber of men and women associated with WHA-TV. The State university's division of radio-television education handles not only the broadcasting phase, but instruction and research. The overall mission is to produce graduates with a broad

competence in the many specific skills in these fields, as well as to produce a growing body of pioneering experimental findings.

TRIBUTE TO FUND FOR ADULT EDUCATION

This very brief review of the background and contributions of WHA-TV could not be complete without paying tribute to the Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education which provided the grant-in-aid of \$100,000 which made it possible for the station to be constructed in the first place. Few seeds have ever grown to such fruition as has the Ford Foundation's splendid aid to educational TV in this country.

Nor can even so brief a report be complete without reference to the splendid contributions of the Educational Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor, Mich., which, for example, provides approximately one-third of WHA's filmed programs.

FINE AID BY COMMERCIAL TV

Let this point be noted, too. In discussing educational television in the 48 States, I do not believe that anyone should commit the error of failing to observe the very important role played in educational activities by commercial television in our land. After all, commercial television is the fundamental type of TV in America. American sponsors have not only paid the bills of the vast TV industry, they have made it possible—directly and indirectly—for commercial TV to aid educational TV.

I might mention at this point that the other day I was pleased to receive a very beautifully illustrated and eloquent book entitled "Educational Television and Groucho Marx" published by the National Broadcasting Co. It describes what I regard as a most enheartening story of the contributions made by commercial television; in this instance, by the NBC network, to educational television.

I like the thoughts expressed by Mr. Robert W. Sarnoff, president of NBC, who said: "Every citizen has a stake in the success with which these stations carry out their mission. The drastic shortage of teachers and classrooms lends special urgency to their efforts to build themselves into a major educational force. Those of us in television have an interest beyond that of the average citizen to lend such support as we can in solving these problems."

He has faithfully put his words into deeds by, for example, the splendid live programs produced by NBC in cooperation with the Educational Television and Radio Center.

But WHA-TV is my basic theme today. For it symbolizes what I regard as some of the very best work in educational television anywhere.

But now let the station tell its own story. I include now excerpts from a report which it filed last midyear, describing the type of program which it carries. At the conclusion is a list of the able members of the university's radio-television committee, together with its radio-TV instructional staff.

EXCERPTS FROM WHA-TV REPORT IN JUNE 1957

B. TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Following are brief descriptions of the major program areas and examples, indicating the range, scope, and variety of programs produced by WHA-TV during its first 3 years of experimentation.

1. Organized instruction for adults

These were programs planned as continuing series or courses for out-of-school listening on the adult level. Some were rather informal; others closely paralleled traditional course offerings.

The university extension division produced telecourses in foreign languages, piano playing, music appreciation, and psychology. The latter course, consisting of 54 half-hour

programs, was offered for college credit along with the correspondence course requirements.

A list of courses broadcast is given subsequently, and information about research which accompanied the broadcasts is to be found in section IV.

Two informal telecourses on the college level should be noted:

(a) And the World Listened: 13 half-hour programs presented dramatic reenactments of memorable speeches by world-famous orators whose words reflected and shaped the times in which they lived and spoke. Prof. Frederick W. Haberman, chairman of the department of speech, served as consultant and narrator for the series.

(b) The National Government: 12 half-hour programs designed to further understanding of the structure and workings of our Federal system of government. The TV teacher was Ralph Huitt, professor of political science, who used a variety of visual materials, including newsreel clips and film footage shot especially for the series. This series evolved from a correspondence course developed by Professor Huitt for the extension division under its contract with United States Armed Forces Institute. The Department of Defense urged the development of the television series, kines of which it purchased for use in military installations around the world as instructional films and for broadcast to troops overseas through its system of television transmitters.

Kinescope recordings of both of these series have been placed in the film library of the bureau of audiovisual instruction and are available for schools and study groups as well as for broadcast by commercial stations in Wisconsin.

Many other telecourses, originating at other universities and colleges, were broadcast by WHA-TV by means of kinescopes and films supplied by the educational television and radio center. These are listed in appendix A.

2. Vocational information and instruction

The department of agricultural journalism of the university, which produces the farm and home radio features over the State radio facilities, was among the first agencies to participate in WHA-TV's programming. From the first week until October 4, 1956, it presented two programs a week in each of two areas:

(a) Today's Home: Quarter-hour programs presenting authentic information and demonstrations on homemaking methods and practices—consumer information, child care, nutrition, etc. The program featured specialists from the school of home economics and Agricultural Extension Service.

(b) Today's Farm: Quarter-hour programs serving farmer interests with latest findings in vocational agriculture: market information, livestock management, farm equipment, soil conservation, etc. The program utilized specialists from the college of agriculture and the Agricultural Extension Service.

The two series gave agricultural and home economics specialists opportunity to acquire considerable training and experience in television. In 1956, because of budget reductions and the need to reach wider audiences, the Department of Agricultural Journalism terminated its television production and confined its work in the medium to developing 5-minute films.

During 1954 the State Department of Agriculture produced a series aimed at farming interests, the Wisconsin Farm Picture, which emphasized crop reporting and predictions.

For housewives a series of special interest was Let's Go Shopping, presented in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. It provided latest consumer information, shopping tips, and data on the best buys in foods and textiles.

Living and Learning, produced by the Madison Vocational and Adult School, presented over a 2-year period a great variety of vocational material. Notable series concerned the Heart Kitchen, child care, driver education, and home safety.

3. News and discussion

(a) Spot news: From the beginning WHA-TV carried a daily quarter-hour newscast presented in cooperation with the school of Journalism. The newscasts were planned to give news of significance to viewers in the area and to go behind the news for pertinent background information, supplied usually by interviews with authorities and visiting specialists. The United Press wire provided news reports, and visuals were derived from the United Press photo service, the U. W. News Service, and other sources. Some feature materials and pictures were supplied by students in the courses in Radio-Television News.

(b) Discussion: This is an area in which WHA-TV has done some of its most significant programming. The station feels that it has a special responsibility for critical inquiry into problems of public concern; accordingly, it has presented a continuing schedule of forums, debates, press conferences, and discussion programs.

4. Programs for children and youth

(a) Out-of-school programs: In this area WHA-TV has achieved recognized success. Before the start of operations, parents and teachers indicated that they felt WHA-TV could make a valuable contribution to children's programs for home viewing; accordingly, considerable effort was directed at fulfilling this expectation. Developments included:

(1) The Friendly Giant: This program, created by Robert Homme, was first broadcast on the inaugural program of WHA-TV, May 3, 1954, and has continued on a five-per-week basis ever since. A quiet, relaxed bedtime program for young children, it presents musical games and a reading of children's books in an appealing setting of a castle inhabited by a friendly giant with various puppet friends. The program has won three first awards in national competition at the Institute for Education by Radio-Television, and kinescope films of the program have been distributed nationally for broadcast by other educational stations and commercial stations as well.

(2) Play Tree: This was a puppet-show series presented for late afternoon viewing, emphasizing songs and the teaching of social values for children.

(3) The Play Wagon: This series of 13 experimental programs made use of television to stimulate young people's participation in creative dramatics.

(4) Views of Youth: This was an extended series providing information and ideas about social behavior and recreation for teen-agers. Subjects ranged from hints on grooming and fashions to suggestions on how to study and how to build a "hi-fi" set. Guidance for the series was provided by a board comprising students and faculty advisers from the area high school.

b. In-school programs: Early efforts in this area were directed at testing the television effectiveness of certain radio programs and teachers known to be successful on the Wisconsin School of the Air. Brief experimental series included programs in drawing, science, nature study, and rhythmic games. Subsequent programs for schools were developed especially for television. They included series in conservation, American history through folksongs and pictures, Wisconsin history as related in children's books, social studies, and arithmetic. Distinctive among these was Figure It Out, planned and presented by Prof. Sara A. Rhue, elementary

teaching specialist in the University of Wisconsin School of Education. A trial series was broadcast in 1955, followed by a revised and expanded series in 1956. The programs were designed to enrich the study of arithmetic by relating the story of the development of our number system through many years and many lands.

Program viewing in the classrooms was arranged in cooperation with the Madison public school system and supervising teachers of Dane County. A total of 36 schools participated in the experiments over the 3-year period.

5. Special features

In this group were a number of one-time-only broadcasts which were not a part of the regular schedule. Such programs included several special dramatic productions and a great number of "remote" programs originated outside the studios.

The first "remote" special feature was a broadcast of Governor Kohler's message to the joint session of the Wisconsin Legislature, January 13, 1955. This broadcast was originated in the assembly chamber of the State capitol and was fed to the WHA-TV transmitter by microwave relay.

As the station acquired more "remote" facilities, it increased its broadcast of programs originating outside of the studios. Coaxial cables leading from the studios to various points on the campus and the conversion of a used truck into a mobile unit permitted the origination of programs directly from the scene. Play rehearsals, concerts, and convocations were given from the Wisconsin Union Theater, and tours of art exhibits were presented from the Memorial Union galleries. A regular series of university symphony orchestra rehearsals was broadcast from Music Hall, and several tours were made of exhibits in the first-floor galleries of the State Historical Society and of its museum. In several instances the station was able to make temporary cable installations to enable it to pick up programs from buildings and grounds in proximity to the studios. Such on-the-spot programs were presented from the printing laboratory of the journalism school, the hydraulics laboratory, and the Lake laboratory, as well as from the union terrace and the lake-shore area.

The 30 special events remotes broadcast by WHA-TV, in addition to the January 1955 broadcast from the State capitol, included the La Follette Centennial Address by Chief Justice Warren, June 19, 1955, State Historical Library; the "Sifting and Winnowing" Plaque Rededication Ceremonies, February 15, 1957, Bascom Hall, and Lincoln Terrace; University of Wisconsin Honors Convocation, June 14, 1957, Wisconsin Union Theater.

6. General programs

(a) Drama: A good deal of effort was devoted to experiments in finding simple, inexpensive ways to present dramatic materials on television for educational needs.

Medea, the first full-scale drama, was completely staged in costume in a studio 15 x 30 feet with a cast of 16. The total effort involved 1,600 hours by 60 people and involved an out-of-pocket cost of \$147.37, of which \$55 went for composition board to cover the studio floors so cameras could be rolled smoothly.

Festival for Easter was a full-hour production telling the Easter story as interpreted in music, painting, and drama. It included participation of a 30-voice capella choir and the staging of a medieval blank-verse drama of the Resurrection. Other full-hour drama presentations included Premiers (three original one-acts), The Imaginary Invalid, and The Shoemaker's House.

A number of student plays originally given in the Play Circle Theater of the Memorial Union were transferred to the TV studio and with some compression and modification presented as television plays.

Dress rehearsals of the Wisconsin Player's productions of Trial by Jury and School for Scandal were broadcast directly from the stage of the Wisconsin Union Theater.

In rehearsal, Twelfth Night. This was a series of five hour-long readings utilizing the rehearsal technique, including comments by the director and questions from the cast, to illuminate Shakespeare's play. The series progressed from the first reading, through blocking and stage business, to a final full-dress performance of one scene.

Drama of Poetry. Readers were used to illustrate points made in Prof. Harry Glicksman's lectures on poetic literature.

The TV Drama Quartet, presented on alternate weeks during the winter of 1956-57, was designed to explore the TV possibilities of readings of a variety of dramatic literature. Programs included Antigone, Electra, The Wasteland, and Prometheus Bound.

(b) Dance: Members of Orchestis, the dance organization of the university, participated in a variety of WHA-TV programs. They played a prominent role in the production of Medea, in which original dance sequences were used to separate the scenes; produced In Season, a special program of original dances and music interpreting poetry of E. E. Cummings; presented a series of lecture demonstrations on elements of the dance; and produced a weekly quarter-hour program called Dance Impromptu consisting of dance improvisations set to classical and modern music.

(c) Music: Music offerings have been greatly varied. They ranged from performances by artists on the School of Music faculty (Pro Arte Quartet, Gunnar Johansen, Leo Steffens) and concerts by choruses and instrumental groups, to quiz programs and courses in playing the piano and music appreciation. Included were:

Looking at Music—telecourse in music appreciation by Prof. Sigfrid Prager.

Key to Music—a series of 32 half-hour illustrated talks by Prof. Hilmar Luckhardt on the elements of music.

Playing the Piano—beginning piano lessons taught on television by Prof. Leon Itlis.

Do You Know Music?—an informal quiz program utilizing a panel of experts to answer a variety of questions about music and composers.

Symphony Rehearsal—a remote pickup from Music Hall of actual rehearsals of the University of Wisconsin Symphony Orchestra. Conductor Richard Church stopped and started the orchestra in accordance with developments and occasionally turned to the TV audience to discuss some phase of the music.

Rather extensive use was made of folk music, in such series as Wisconsin Is My Doorstep, The Play Tree, Song Pictures of America, and America in Verse and Song.

The Art of Listening was an informal music appreciation series in which fine recorded music was played, with the host and viewer listening together.

(d) Literature: In addition to the dramatic literature previously mentioned, other types of literature—stories and poetry—have been the subject of experimentation. Prof. Raymond Stanley, working with Professors Pooley and Glicksman, presented a number of poetry programs (Drama in Poetry, Drama of Poetry), and with Ballardier Ed Sprague, presented a combination of poetry, picture, and song (America in Verse and Song).

During June 1957, Of Books and Such, a series of experimental programs using the informal panel quiz approach to literature was presented with promising results.

(e) Art: WHA-TV has made extensive use of television to bring current area art exhibits into the home. Program series known as Gallery and Arts in Revue presented portions of major exhibitions held in Madison. Paintings, ceramics, sculpture, and graphics were brought to the studio for televising, accompanied by comment by the artists or art experts. Exhibits have been transported to the studio from the Madison Free Library, Vocational School, School of Education, Memorial Library, and the Madison Savings & Loan Building. In some instances cameras have been taken directly to the galleries in the memorial union or historical library for on-the-spot television tours of the exhibits.

C. PROGRAM RESOURCES AND PARTICIPANTS

Another aspect of the experimental nature of WHA-TV has been reflected in a very active exploration of program resources of the State, university, and community, and a search for personnel who can effectively communicate on television. As indicated below, there has been extensive and widespread participation by many agencies and institutions.

1. State agencies

(a) University: The university serves as the main source of program originations for WHA-TV in accordance with its obligation to develop improved learning tools and techniques and to extend its benefits to the people of the State. Approximately 35 percent of the WHA-TV program originations during the first 3 years came from the university. Many departments and divisions participated, with the extension division as the main contributor. Other instructional units which made extensive contributions are: college of agriculture, school of home economics, school of music, department of speech, school of medicine, the department of athletics, the school of journalism, and the department of physical education—women.

Many faculty members participated in the form of occasional appearances and, in some cases, in sustained series. Such participation, with the exception of two series produced by the extension division, was on a voluntary basis without extra compensation or reduced teaching load.

University students participated by serving on camera crews, as panelists (Quiz the Professor), and as actors, musicians, readers, and dancers in a variety of broadcasts.

(b) State boards, commissions, departments: State agencies participated extensively, particularly during the first year, in exploring the potentials of television for their purposes. The Department of Agriculture and the Conservation Commission presented program series, and others presented several periodic broadcasts. Most of the participation was in a program entitled "At Your Service," a series designed to promote a better understanding of the functions and services of our State government.

2. Civic groups, quasi-official agencies, etc.

A variety of organizations and public service agencies contributed to the program service. These ranged from municipal institutions such as schools and libraries to local chapters of organizations such as the Red Cross, Boy Scouts of America, and the Association for Mental Health. The Men's Service Clubs of Madison took part in a series of seven programs under the title of "Civic Service." Some agencies produced complete series: State Medical Society (March of Medicine), and American Automobile Association (Wisconsin Weekend). The Madison Vocational and Adult School presented a continuing series of weekly half-hour programs throughout the school years 1955-56 and 1956-57 under the general title of "Living and Learning."

3. Federal agencies

Representatives of Government agencies, particularly agents of various agricultural branches, were frequent guests on WHA-TV programs. One series, *Let's Go Shopping*, was presented under the auspices of the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture.

A generous number of public service announcements, slides, and film clips were used in behalf of such agencies as Navy, Army, Air Force, and Marine recruitment, United States Treasury Department, Social Security Administration, Veterans' Administration, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

4. National and international agencies

Spot announcements and film clips were presented for many charitable and social service agency promotions: muscular dystrophy, mental health, crippled children, March of Dimes, etc.

Film program sources included the British Information Service, United Nations, India Information Service, and the National Film Board of Canada.

5. Educational television and radio center

The main source of educational TV programs is the Educational Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor, Mich. The center acquires and distributes kinescopes and films to affiliated educational television stations across the Nation. It provided WHA-TV with an average of 5 hours of filmed programs per week (approximately a third of the schedule) and thus gave Madison area viewers the opportunity of seeing the best of the educational TV programs produced across the Nation. Many programs featured distinguished scholars, artists, musicians, and scientists who would otherwise be unavailable to the community.

In 1957, the center cooperated with the National Broadcasting Co. to present a live network program service to educational stations on the basis of 5 programs a week for 13 weeks. These and other center programs are listed in appendix A.

D. ADDITIONAL USES OF WHA-TV PROGRAMS

1. National distribution

Through the making and distribution of kinescope recordings (TV films) certain WHA-TV programs are given lasting value and extended use. A notable example is the *Friendly Giant*, popular children's program originated by WHA-TV and currently broadcast by 18 educational stations throughout the country. Under a special arrangement with the Educational Television and Radio Center, the university laboratory has made 156 kinescopes of the *Friendly Giant*, thereby enabling other educational stations to broadcast the feature three times weekly for a year without repetition.

2. To Armed Forces overseas

During 1956 WHA-TV produced 12 programs in a series, the National Government, designed to show how our Government functions and to build better understanding of American democracy. The programs, produced in cooperation with the university extension division and the United States Department of Defense, are to be broadcast by television stations at military installations overseas and used as films for special study purposes by Armed Forces elsewhere.

3. Commercial stations

From the beginning the university extension division has made kinescope recordings of its television productions for distribution by the bureau of audiovisual instruction. These are available to commercial stations and have been broadcast by stations in Eau Claire, Green Bay, La Crosse, Madison, Marinette, Milwaukee, and Wausau.

4. Schools and study groups

Since a kinescope recording is actually a 16 mm. film, it can be used in classrooms and for adult group study wherever a projector is available. The bureau of audiovisual instruction lists eight series of WHA-TV programs in its 1957 film catalog.

E. AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Two WHA-TV-produced programs have been accorded recognition at the Annual Exhibition of Educational Radio and Television Programs conducted by Ohio State University at Columbus, Ohio.

The *Friendly Giant* won a first award in the children's out-of-school classification for 3 consecutive years, 1955-57. Quiz the Professor won an honorable mention in 1956 in the classification of public affairs programs.

Further recognition for WHA-TV came in the form of a contract from the Educational Television and Radio Center to produce 13 full-hour dramatic programs, *Great Plays in Rehearsal*, based on a trial series of four programs presented during the spring of 1956. This should result in a series of significant programs in an area hitherto unexplored by educational television stations.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN DIVISION OF RADIO-TELEVISION EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY RADIO-TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Henry L. Ewbank, department of speech (chairman).

Henry L. Ahlgren, associate director of agricultural extension.

Frederick W. Haberman, department of speech.

Glenn Koehler, department of electrical engineering.

Allan W. Ostar, university extension division.

Robert C. Pooley, department of integrated liberal studies.

Lindley J. Stiles, dean, school of education.

Robert Taylor, director, university news service.

Walter A. Wittich, school of education.

RADIO-TELEVISION INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

Harold B. McCarty, professor of radio-television education and director, division of radio-television education.

Robert N. Dick, coordinator, radio-television, university extension division.

S. Watson Dunn, associate professor of journalism and commerce.

Harold A. Engel, professor of radio-television education.

Henry L. Ewbank, professor of speech.

William G. Harley, professor of radio-television education.

Mrs. Aline W. Hazard, assistant professor of agricultural journalism.

Arlene McKellar, associate professor of radio-television education.

Jerry C. McNeely, assistant professor of speech.

Ordean G. Ness, assistant professor of speech.

Karl F. Schmidt, assistant professor of radio-television education.

James A. Schwalbach, associate professor of agricultural and extension education.

Raymond J. Stanley, associate professor of radio-television education.

John H. Stiehl, associate professor of radio-television education.

Robert Taylor, director, university news service; associate professor of journalism.

Donald J. Voegeli, assistant professor of radio-television education.

Roy C. Vogelmann, associate professor of radio-television education.

Maurice E. White, associate professor of agricultural journalism.

Tight Money Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, during the year 1957 the Federal Reserve Board rapidly—and in my opinion recklessly—applied the tight money policy to the economy of the United States. Again Members of Congress called attention to the dangers which the policy invited. As a result, we are now in a recession. Unemployment is at its highest point in 8 years. Farm problems which have been severe have been made worse and the trek of farm families away from the farms where they can no longer make a living has been increased.

Housing construction, one of the greatest of the employers of labor, hit a postwar low in 1957. Capital expansion of industry is down. In many communities necessary schools could not be built. More and more small businesses have gone to the wall. In the last five months or more billions of dollars have been cut from the value of stocks listed on the stock exchanges.

The Federal Reserve System has made one belated cut in the rediscount rate. I notice recently that the interest rate on prime commercial paper has been reduced one small notch. Yet the basic interest rates have not come down enough nor fast enough to undo the damage which the tight money policy caused last year.

It is time, in my judgment, for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to admit that it went too far and too fast in committing this Nation to a system of scarce and high-priced money.

It has never seemed to me that the basic causes of the inflation which we have been going through would be cured by any tight-money policy. This has been proved by recent events. Money has been made tight and costly yet prices have not come down. On the contrary they have rapidly increased.

I doubt that there is a Member of the House who has returned to Washington free of concern about the current recession and its effect on the people the country over. In this connection I wish to quote briefly from an article by Richard A. Lester, professor of economics at Princeton University. In discussing the proposals by labor unions for wage increases this year as a tonic against recession, Professor Lester has this to say, and I quote:

To organized labor, wage increases are taken as an economic cure-all for almost everything. The recent AFL-CIO convention passed a resolution declaring that "the very fact of an economic slackening makes it doubly imperative that unions gain sizable wage increases to bolster consumer buying power" and stimulate an upturn in the economy. That negotiation of substantial boosts

for labor would prevent and overcome a recession like the current one is, however, questionable. The growth of consumption has been a rather steady factor in our postwar economy. The big spurts and relapses have occurred mainly in capital outlays—for new plants and equipment, manufacturers' inventories, and housing. The high-interest, tight-money policy, badly overdone in the past year, has been particularly destructive here. And changing the tight-money policy is therefore likely to be a better cure than boosting wages.

This is the opinion of a seasoned expert. I commend it to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I suggest the times and the economic situation of the Nation demand a slackening of this "destructive" and "badly overdone" tight-money policy. It is within the power of the Federal Reserve Board to bring down interest rates at any time it pleases. That time is right now.

Free Trade or Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, commerce among nations is a very great and involved subject. It challenges even the experts. Even experts disagree. This, however, does not exempt or excuse any Member of Congress from giving the subject his most careful study and full consideration. Since trade with other nations may affect the very livelihood of many of our constituents, indeed the very economic well-being of the Nation, it becomes a subject that we must consider. The fact that it is difficult and involved does not excuse us from giving it our very best. We are going to determine during this session whether or not change is needed in our laws relating to trade with other countries, what those changes should be, and legislation that will effect them. Since the reciprocal-trade law is expiring, Congressional action is imperative.

TRADE WITH FRIENDLY COUNTRIES IS DESIRABLE

In the world we live in today, friendly nations, particularly those outside the Iron Curtain, should be more than ever eager to aid and assist each other. The strength and well-being of one is of interest to all. Our record in recent years bears abundant proof of our Nation's desire to be helpful to our neighbor nations. No nation in history can even approach our magnificent record in aiding, often at great sacrifice to ourselves, the nations that have been allied with us where we have had common cause in world affairs. Many feel that we have even gone too far along these lines. However, I know of no one in the Congress who would not be most willing to give aid to friendly nations if at the same time we were incurring no disadvantage to ourselves. I feel that our trade relations with other nations can and should be so conducted. Trade

among nations is not different from trade among families. When families trade each party is convinced that the trade is surely not against the best interest of either; in fact, it is the rule that trade, when engaged in, is to the best interests of all parties. Such trade is truly desirable.

FREE TRADE IS UNFAIR

Trade may be of very great advantage to some but at the great disadvantage of others. Production costs vary in different countries. Currency values by which goods exchange and for which goods are produced, also vary in different countries. Living standards of workers, and also employers, also vary greatly in different countries. For these reasons there cannot be free trade and fair trade to all parties at the same time. The party in disadvantage is the nation with the highest standard of living, and as the nations are now constituted, this means our own. It is easy to see that American producers cannot compete in a free market, with a nation with lower living standards, lower labor costs, lower price levels, and hope to survive.

Some of the greatest potentially industrial nations now have a wage level even as low as one-tenth of that in the United States. Labor costs represent a substantial part of the cost of production. Obviously, the United States producer could not pay \$100 for labor on a product where its competitor in a free market pays only \$10. One does not need to be an expert to see this. Either America must lose that market, reduce its production costs, including the wages paid workers in order to meet the competition, or provide import controls to protect our own workers and our own industries. This fact is self-evident. It has been the same since the time when American business and American workers became better paid than the businesses and workers in these other nations. We have built this higher standard. We have proven it can be done. We have lived with it and by it for many years. We can, we should, and I trust we will maintain it.

We should trade freely as long as the imports coming into our markets do not harm a domestic industry. If and when an import item harms a domestic industry, then and there that import should be stopped. It seems to me that the national interest demands that this simple rule be applied. Those who cry for free trade, if they have their way will be commemorated by the graves of American industries that have been sacrificed. The way will be crowded with displaced American workers and their families who could not exist in free competition with those whose living standards were as low as one-tenth of their own.

THERE ARE MANY THINGS WE NEED TO IMPORT

There is a huge demand for many products that are not produced at all in the United States. There are other products where the production here is far short of our needs. Imports of such products are to our great advantage. They run into very great volume. To sell them here is a benefit to our neighbor country from whence they come. To

be able to acquire and enjoy them is of great benefit to our people. Such international trade is most desirable. I believe every Member of Congress will agree. To this extent, then, I believe we might well—all of us—be termed pro-international trade. The strength of our economy and that of our friends may measure our ability to survive in this very highly competitive world. It may also measure the extent that we may continue to hold our high standard of living, and, if so, to what extent we may be able to increase and expand it. Trade among the nations to the extent that it is fair and beneficial to all parties is good and should be encouraged.

HOW ABOUT TRADE WITH THOSE WHO MAY NOT BE FRIENDLY?

Should we trade with our friends only? Or should trade be extended to include those nations which are not friends? If we should trade with our friendly neighbors, to what extent? How far should we go in an effort to influence our friends with regard to their trade with nations that are now somewhat unfriendly?

We hear so much these days about how necessary it is for our friendly neighbor, Japan, to export and that if we do not open our markets for more and more of her products, then, of necessity, she must sell to Communist Russia, or to Communist China. Well, just why should she not sell to Communist Russia? We do. Why should she not sell to Communist China? England does. We sell to England; England sells to Communist China. Why should we not sell also to Communist China? Why should not Japan sell to her near, though unfriendly, neighbor? Surely, if it is all right for England it should not be so wrong for Japan. Surely, also, it would be far better for us to see Japan selling to Communist Russia and China rather than to see imports from Japan destroying healthy industries and taking away thousands of well-paid jobs for American workers.

If we are to sacrifice, say a number of our own industries in order to support the economy of a friendly ally, we are being manifestly unfair with our own people. Why should one factory be doomed and its hundreds or even thousands of workers be forced into an existence on a Government sale?

Do the free traders think they can destroy important segments of our economy without endangering the general welfare? We may think we can operate or cause this injustice without affecting other industries, but things just do not work out that way. They tell us that industries like plywood, pottery, clothespins, textiles, chemicals, to name only a portion of them, are all expendable; that the workers in these industries should be taken under the protection of the Government and trained for other kinds of work and that the factories should be either let go or be converted into other types of production. They do not tell us, however, what other work the workers will be trained to perform.

They offer no hope for those workers who are somewhat advanced in years and are too old to be trained again to start out new in some other field. Who

will take the place of these millions of workers in the expendable plants in the lines of customers for homes, appliances, clothing, food, automobiles, and all of our other industries?

If the free traders have their way, we shall move into an economic debacle that will not only ruin those industries and workers which have so far been marked as expendable, but others will be drawn into the maelstrom and all will be definitely, and soon, very adversely affected.

IMPORTS SHOULD BE DEFINITELY LIMITED

Our market should be wide open to imports of all items that it will take which are not available from domestic producers. They should also be open to imports in those lines where domestic production does not meet the demand, up to the point where the imports do not adversely affect our domestic producers. Our market should be closed to all items that are produced in abundance by domestic producers.

Laws to protect our domestic economy are necessary. Such laws are fair. They permit us to engage in trade that is good for the United States of America. This should be our first and foremost consideration. If it is to our intelligent self-interest to aid the economies of friendly neighbor nations, then that aid does not penalize a segment of native industry by importing cheap substitutes to destroy them. This is what I mean by fair trade versus free trade. If our foreign trade is to be a part of our overall foreign policy, let it be fair to the hundreds of small industries that mean so much to our own citizens. Let it be tailored to serve the best interests of the United States as well as the interests of the nations with whom she trades. Let our commerce with the nations, our political arrangements, and our cultural activities, in fact all of our relationships with neighbor nations—friendly or otherwise—be tailored to be helpful to others but first, last, and all the time, be done to promote the general welfare of everyone in the United States of America. We can be the good neighbor to others. We can also be true to our own.

Ordeal by Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, hunger is still an immediate threat to the happiness, to the very survival, of millions of people in many parts of the world. I am convinced that our Government in the United States, which is uniquely blessed with a superabundance of food, has fallen far short of its opportunities to make our food really count in the efforts of humanity to establish the peaceful and prosperous world which ordinary people everywhere desire.

No one, in my estimation, better understands the opportunities which our

agricultural abundance offers to this Nation than the able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He has written an article entitled "Ordeal by Hunger," for the fall 1957 issue of the Co-op Grain Quarterly, published by the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. Because of the extremely important observations the Senator makes regarding the national interest in wiser use of our agricultural resources, I ask unanimous consent to have the article published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDEAL BY HUNGER

(By Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY)

Food and fiber is a great potential force for freedom in the world today, an influential instrument with which we are blessed in abundance if we are only wise enough to use it for building toward friendship and peace.

That conclusion is inescapable after my recent tour of Italy, Egypt, Lebanon, Israel, Greece, and Spain.

Food is the common denominator of international life.

Lack of adequate food is the underlying factor in many of the economic and political problems bringing trouble to this area of the world.

The answer is in our hands. It rests in our own abundance, and our potential to produce in even more abundance if we have the vision and imagination to use it for human good.

I am convinced that Government policy has been too shortsighted about how powerful a factor sharing of our abundance of food and fiber can be in our foreign relations. A disservice has been done the American people by creating the impression our abundance was just an unwanted headache, a problem instead of a blessing.

We need to do an about-face. We need to look upon our great agricultural production and productive capacity as a source of strength in the world scene. Instead of telling farm families to quit producing—or forcing them to do so by deliberately depressing farm prices and income to seek scarcity as a cold economic answer to a human problem—we as a nation should say "thank God" for the farmers who have kept us from the deprivation and hunger facing vast areas of the world. We should see that our farm people are properly rewarded for making available to our Nation not only the means of visibly expressing our humanitarian concern for fellow mankind everywhere—but also giving us a tremendous bargaining power in growing economic warfare against Communist Russia.

American food and fiber is vital to the very existence of millions of undernourished people—and the brightest ray of hope for building stronger economies and greater political stability in most of the countries I visited.

I wish every American farmer who has been told he must drastically cut down his production could have walked with me through the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, the orphanages in Greece, or among the masses of unemployed huddled in shanty towns in Spain. I wish they could have seen the young hands outstretched for food.

I wish our farmers could have been with me in Italy to hear our own Embassy officials flatly declare that our country's most effective weapon against communism in that area had been the distribution of American food directly to the people by our church and other voluntary agencies.

I wish, too, they could have been along to hear Spanish officials explain how they had

been trying in vain to buy 500,000 tons of wheat from America and now faced bread rationing as a result of our inaction. I wish all of you could have heard that story repeated in Israel, Greece, and other lands.

But most of all I wish one could have been along to give me a better answer than I could provide to this question I encountered at every turn:

How can a great nation like the United States justify spending a billion dollars paying farmers not to produce, and yet quibble about paying them to produce for our friends and allies who so urgently need that food?

No one who has walked in the midst of mass want and deprivation as I did, could ever face the American farmers and talk about surplus.

Believe me, there is no surplus—unless it is a surplus of people who need the life-giving benefits of the blessings of food we have to bestow.

It isn't a question of just a gigantic giveaway.

Most of the food and fiber can be marketed for foreign currencies, if we expand and extend Public Law 480. Countries want to buy—but they lack American dollars.

We have uses for foreign currencies to finance economic development loans to other countries, to pay our own obligations abroad, for military procurement, and for many other purposes. We can do more for peace by using such funds obtained with American food to finance vocational education, for example, than we can by just shipping guns or handing over American dollars.

We can use our foods to form the foundation of an entire new foreign and economic trade policy for American business and industry—and achieve many of our foreign policy objectives at less cost.

We have had lots of lipservice to trade, not aid, but little concrete action. One of the objectives of our foreign policy has been to encourage American business and industry to invest abroad, to use its know-how, to help build economies of other free countries—and to keep the Soviet orbit from making neutral countries dependent on them for industrial products.

Our business firms tell us they have problems borrowing foreign currencies for capital investments and operating expenses abroad. Why doesn't it make good sense to earmark a part of the funds received from sale of American farm products, for loans to American business enterprises with branches or affiliates abroad?

Such a policy serves dual purposes: It broadens America's economic and trade influence in the world, and it throws the support of American business and industry behind a farm program based on abundance instead of scarcity.

I talked with American businessmen abroad, and with more since my return. They would welcome such a plan, and would vigorously support expansion of farm marketing for foreign currencies.

In effect, we would be turning our farm abundance, beyond our domestic needs and normal dollar exports, into a big revolving loan fund to finance most of our foreign-aid operations as well as American business expansion abroad. We would be loaning the money, and drawing interest on it, instead of giving outright dollar grants. The dollars we as a nation invested to create such a program, would be going to American producers of farm products—but the benefits would be shared by everyone, at home and abroad.

On the humanitarian side, beyond food sales, we can and should do more to support the work of our great church and philanthropic agencies such as CARE.

Whether we give or sell our food abundance, let's not cheapen it by labeling it surplus, calling it a problem, and advertising to the world that we really do not care about

hungry people—we just want to get rid of something we do not want.

Even Russia is smarter than that. After we had refused to sell Egypt any of our wheat, despite all our talk about surplus, they turned to Russia. At first Moscow said they doubted they could do it—they needed all the wheat they had. Then they came back to the Egyptians saying, in effect, "Here—we haven't much, but we will share it with you." They sent a shipload or so of wheat—and ballyhooed it into a major propaganda victory.

We have allies overseas who we are depending upon, under NATO, to hold the line of freedom in event of another all-out war. Yet these are in food deficit countries, where armies would collapse without continuing supplies of food from abroad.

Everywhere you turn—among diplomats, among military leaders, among businessmen, among social and welfare workers—the answer comes back the same: food. Food can be a vital key to success or failure in our foreign relations.

Are we recognizing that fact?

Jewish Contributions to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered before the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York at a dinner in my honor on December 15, 1957:

ADDRESS BY HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES, DECEMBER 15, 1957

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very grateful for the opportunity to be here with you today. I am also grateful for the opportunity to see so many of my friends, as well as the opportunity to exchange a few thoughts and opinions with you.

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies and its scope of activities is well known to me for many years. Many of my Jewish friends have spoken to me with great pride of your work and achievements in human welfare. And you have much to be proud of in this work of unselfish service to others. Charity is one of the basic foundations of a free and humane civilization. The great sages and the inspiring works of your faith, as of mine, have emphasized it strongly.

The late Albert Einstein once said: "Only a life lived for others is a life worth while." And someone else put this thought in these words: "Give to the world the best you have, and the best will come back to you." The ideal of service to others, aside from its practical purposes, is sometimes more rewarding to the spirit of the giver than to the recipient. So in this sense, I wish to extend to all of you my deep appreciation for the service you are rendering to the less fortunate of your kinsmen. And with the approach of a new year, I pray that the year ahead may be a successful one for your endeavors, and may you go from strength to strength.

In times such as these, when the free world is threatened by tyranny and the enslavement of humanity, I believe it is of utmost importance for us to underscore the spirit of American freedom and the part

played by the various minority and nationality groups in strengthening our freedoms and building America to its present greatness. At the moment, of course, I am thinking of the honorable role played by the Jews of this country in helping to make America strong and to enrich American democracy.

In the past 300 years, since that day in September of 1654 when the first group of Jews numbering 23 souls in search of freedom landed at New Amsterdam, Jews have helped to build this country and have helped it attain its position of leadership in nearly all human endeavors. Together with their neighbors, Jews have worked to attain freedom of religion, to establish their rights to citizenship, to share in building and defending the communities in which they lived. Throughout these three centuries, they have been part and parcel of America, just as have all other who sought refuge along these friendly shores.

The record, for anyone who cares to consult it, is one of remarkable contributions on the part of American Jews to the well-being, the growth, and the preservation of the United States as the foremost democratic nation in the world. In countless ways have the Jews helped to advance this Nation on the road to a strong and secure bulwark of freedom. The American Jewish community, numbering some 5½ million people, is proud of the role that the Jews of today and their forebears in the past have played in the arts and sciences, in industry and commerce, in cultural and intellectual enlightenment, in religious toleration, in politics and statesmanship, and last but not least on the field of battle in defense of American honor and security.

We have been taught from our earliest days that democracy is the rule of the majority. That is true, but I prefer to see it in another way. To me, democracy also represents the zealous protection of the rights of the minority—and basically each one of us in this country belongs to some minority: because of racial descent, national origin, religious belief, economic position, political adherence, social status, or geographic location. The founders of this Nation recognized this situation and, therefore, they adopted the Bill of Rights which is the basis for all our civil rights and civil liberties.

Whether we be rich or poor, foreign-born or native, white or Negro, Christian, or Jew, northerner or southerner, Democrat, or Republican, we enjoy these rights alike. Destroy the rights of any one American, and the rights of all Americans are at once jeopardized. We all have certain inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To make it more specific, I would say we all have the right to worship God according to our conscience, the right to earn a livelihood and live in dignity, the right to an education that will develop our talents and capacities to serve our country and fellowmen. These are minimum rights and privileges. Any one who attempts to deny those rights to any American is betraying our past and present, and undermining our future.

America means unity, not divisive activity. We must have unity of purpose, as well as unity of the people. In the world in which we live we must see our goals ahead with clarity and understanding, otherwise we shall all be doomed. We cannot afford the luxury of casting aspersions on one group or another in our midst, whether it be Negroes, Jews, Italians, Irish, or any other group. This is a time when we must stand together, shoulder to shoulder, under the banner of liberty, in defense of our way of life as opposed to Communist enslavement.

The Jews of America have throughout our Nation's history been a force for unity. American history is replete with many examples of Jewish men and women who have rendered dedicated and unselfish service to this country in times of war and peace. I

do not want to overburden you with many names, but allow me to mention just a few who helped write golden pages in American history:

Isaac Franks, who was aide de camp to Gen. George Washington during the Revolutionary War with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Haym Salomon, a Polish Jew, who helped finance Washington's army.

Judah P. Benjamin, a Senator from Louisiana and an outstanding leader of the Confederacy during the Civil War.

Emma Lazarus, the great poetess, whose poem *The New Colossus* is engraved on the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty.

David Belasco, the pioneer of the American theater.

Joseph Pulitzer and Adolph S. Ochs, who by their achievements in journalism have helped to fully realize the freedom of the press in this country.

Samuel Gompers, who built the American labor movement to its present position of influence.

Supreme Court Justices Louis D. Brandeis, Benjamin N. Cardozo, and Felix Frankfurter, who have rendered great service in our highest tribunal in the land.

Bernard Baruch, the elder statesman and adviser of American Presidents.

And, of course, our very beloved former Governor of New York and former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, whose record of public service is unmatched.

Need I mention more such names? You know them as well as I do. You can find them in any book on American history. But what does all this prove? Simply this: That in a democracy such as ours, where the rights of all citizens are recognized and protected, the Jews have made significant contributions in every field of human endeavor. Where given the opportunity, the Jews contributed of their brain and brawn and have helped make America what it is today—the greatest democratic nation on earth and the spokesman for freemen everywhere. What is true regarding the role of the Jews is also true regarding every other minority group in this country. All of them share alike in their efforts and responsibilities, in their duties and achievements, in their loyalty and patriotism.

Bigotry against one group is a threat to all others. Practicing discrimination and intolerance against Jews, will eventually affect Catholics and Negroes, Italians and Poles. It will affect us all and will poison our hearts and minds at a time when we need unity most, in order to form a common front against a common enemy who is threatening our land, our way of life, our whole future.

Ours is a plural democracy. It is perhaps one of the greatest sources of strength for this country which consists of so many different and varied groups, each of them contributing of its best, culturally, economically, politically, morally, and in every other way. Those who preach racial and religious intolerance do not understand the meaning and the goals of America—genuine understanding, mutual cooperation, and common brotherhood.

Let me conclude with this little story. It is told that when God made the oyster, He provided him with absolute economic security. He built the oyster a house, a shell, to protect him against his enemies. When the oyster is hungry, he simply opens his shell and food rushes in for him. But when God made the eagle, He told him: "The blue sky is your limit. Go, find your own shelter and build your own home." And so the eagle builds his nest on the highest mountain crag, where wind and storm threaten him all the time. For food he has to fly long distances through rain, snow, wind, and cold.

My friends, when America had to select a national emblem, it selected the eagle, not

the oyster. And since then our limit, too, has been the sky. Like the eagle, we are not frightened by winds and storms. We have found shelter and food, we have built this land to its present glory, we even have enough to share with other nations. But all this was achieved only through cooperation and unity and understanding. It would not have been possible otherwise. Let us continue in that same spirit. Let each of us contribute to the best of his ability as in the past toward a strong, a safe, and a secure America for all.

An Immigration Policy for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I will make before the American Council of Jewish Women, Friday, January 17, 1958:

AN IMMIGRATION POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

Please do not ascribe to me any wish to flatter when I tell you, with utmost sincerity, that I consider the Council of Jewish Women one of the most intelligent, perceptive, and forward-looking groups on the American scene today. I know how painstakingly the council's representatives—and this I know from my own personal experience—keep abreast of affairs in Washington, scrutinize the bills, educate themselves on the pros and cons of the vital issues before the Congress. The council could never be accused—as so many groups can easily be accused—of trying to squeeze or stretch the facts to fit a preconceived notion.

That is why, knowing that the opinions of the council are informed opinions, I welcome this opportunity to talk to you freely, without the sense of being irked by the necessity to please.

The subject of an immigration policy for the United States is one, I sometimes feel, that has been drowned by a deluge of words. There is none of us who has been intimately concerned with the liberalization of our immigration policy who has not, at one time or another, felt that whatever observations we can make have long since become trite and platitudinous. Emma Lazarus' inscription on the Statue of Liberty has been quoted so often that even the most ardent supporters of good immigration legislation must cringe at its sound.

Let us make no mistake; this is a danger. Too many of us get weary of the old subjects, tired of the old tune, not realizing, of course, that we must go on talking, must go on agitating, must go on sponsoring, because the remedy—the just and right remedy—has not as yet been supplied. This is precisely what has happened in the whole area of refugee relief. People grew weary of the refrain. Then we enter into a new phase of the battle: To battle the apathy that follows the weariness.

This is always the danger point: The flagging of enthusiasm that ends inevitably in retreat. And yet the fact of the refugee is an inescapable fact of contemporary history. Geographical partition produces refugees. Political divisions produce refugees. Supernationalist movements produce refugees. And, tired as we may be of the story,

the refugee exists, and to turn aside in weariness will not erase the fact of his existence.

This Congress enacted, in the first session, a modest immigration law which will benefit, it is estimated roughly, some 80,000 aliens, among them orphans, close relatives of United States citizens, those afflicted with tuberculosis, those who were guilty of misrepresentation of facts, and a small measure of relief for those escaping from Communist or Communist-dominated countries and the Middle East. The question then remains, having taken this step forward, How much further will the Congress go?

I am not clairvoyant and do not presume to know. But I do know what is unfavorable and what is favorable in the climate which could or could not produce changes in the immigration law. I know that approximately two-thirds of the Congress are against change; particularly, they are opposed to any change in the national origins system.

I know, too, that there will be a different argument used this time to uphold the national origins system. Spokesmen against change will move away from its heaviest emphasis on possible subversives, and even away from the argument of inability of southern Europeans to assimilate easily into our culture. The argument is shifting to what will undoubtedly be termed "problems of overpopulation." It will be pointed out that we already have a population of some 170 million; that in about 20 years the population of the United States will increase by some 60 million; that the pattern of large families will continue; that our schools are overcrowded, to put it mildly; that our hospitals are already inadequate for our growing population; that automation is and will continue at accelerating pace to displace American workers; that increased population—either through natural increase or through immigration—will increase demands which, in turn, will increase inflation because productivity will not catch up with such demands.

It will be argued that immigrants almost invariably settle in cities already populated beyond the point of comfort, adding to congestion and, hence, contributing to delinquency. It will be argued that immigrants do not settle on farms where population is decreasing.

These, I believe, will be the main burden of the refrain. These arguments will have to be answered and I maintain that all these assertions can be rationally met.

I would like to make one modification. I have seen growing evidence of the adoption of these arguments by former proponents of liberal immigration. I have been told that some groups would be willing to settle for the change from a 1920 census base to a 1950 census base, a redistribution of unused quotas, and a modification of some of the deportation provisions. They have based their conclusions on the arguments I have just given you. I have been advised that they will stop pressing for the departure from the national origins system.

What I cannot understand is the perfectly obvious flaw in this kind of reasoning. Assuming for a moment—and I, for one, do not make such assumption—that increased immigration is at this time against the best national interests, what in the name of sanity has that to do with discrimination in public law? If the United States admits 2, 5, 25, or 250,000, must they not be admitted on an equality of selection? Must they not be admitted on criteria that apply to all peoples, regardless of race, color, or creed? We must be prepared to meet these arguments, not with heat, but with light.

Hearings on my bill, H. R. 3364, will be held early in this session. It may be that the council will be among the groups to

testify. I ask you to depart from exhortation and generalization and denunciation, and to concentrate on meeting the arguments I have given above. The arguments must be based on America's imperative need to be, above all, just to all people. The argument must be based on America's absorptive capacity. The argument must be lodged in facts and figures on America's new industry, on our decreasing pool of skilled and unskilled workers. The American image has been badly damaged upon our insistence on the retention of the national origins system.

If sputnik has caused us to lose face and threatens to drive noncommitted nations into the eastern camp, then how many years have we had of losing face among the noncommitted nations when America's basic immigration law says that one group of people is more desirable than another?

I believe that what we have to seek to establish at this point is not so much an unrealistic increase in numbers permitted to enter the United States, but the reassertion in our immigration law of the American principle of equality of opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, or creed. I believe it can be shown that the rigid quota system applied to Europe, Asia, or Africa, yet removed from the Western Hemisphere, has resulted in weakening the argument that some persons assimilate easily and others not at all.

Some 49,000 Mexicans enter the United States each year, as against approximately 210,000 from Europe, Asia, and Africa all together. I have seen no injury to America from the Mexican influx, nor has it been a subject for comment by any of our immigration restrictionists. I merely point this out to show the fallacy of the restrictionists' thinking when it is based on a pretended homogeneity of the American people.

Around the sixth century, A. D., when few Europeans could write, the Chinese had already invented paper. Later, they invented the printing press. There is no such thing as white race supremacy. Centuries before America was discovered, when Europe was still a continent of barbarians, other peoples of many races found better ways of living. Arabs invented numerals, the Phoenicians the alphabet and money, the Chaldeans astronomy. The Celts invented the wheel plow. The Chinese invented the compass, and porcelain. Yet, strangely, these very races are unfairly dealt with in our immigration statutes.

This is the kind of testimony we will need, indeed, must have. Let the facts speak rather than emotion, for emotion only engenders emotion in turn, and consequently we go around and around the same circle as we have done these many years.

You will agree that limits must be set; not all will agree as to what those limits should be. For my part, I seek to have established a total annual quota of 250,000. I have based this on the average number of immigrants actually admitted into the United States within the last decade. My new bill, in most aspects, is similar to the legislation introduced in the 84th Congress and known as the Celler-Lehman bill, but I have extensively revised the earlier bill in its two most significant areas.

In retaining the basic features of the Celler-Lehman bill, I am, of course, proposing the elimination of the discriminatory features of the present law. Under my proposal, there will be no discrimination based on national origin or race, and there will be no classification of United States citizens into two categories, native-born and naturalized. There will be no additional grounds for loss of United States citizenship by naturalized citizens except those that apply to native-born citizens.

All provisions of the present law which permit its retroactive application in deportation proceedings have been eliminated in my

bill. Similarly, all of the unduly harsh provisions applicable now in exclusion proceedings have been humanized in my proposal. I have provided for a full and unlimited judicial review of administrative decisions made in all immigration and naturalization processes, including deportation and entry, and I have retained all the humanitarian provisions of the Celler-Lehman bill designed to prevent the separation of families. I have made the provisions applicable to suspension of deportation more human by eliminating the stiff restrictions of the present law in removing the requirement that suspension of deportation could be granted only if it would cause what the present law refers to as "exceptionally and extremely unusual hardship."

The revised features of my new bill pertain to what I believe is the heart of our immigration policy, namely (1) our quota system, and (2) jurisdiction over immigration.

The bill I am offering contains a new formula for the distribution of quota immigrant visas. This is a new formula devised for the first time since 1921, not based on national origins and not depending on any "nose count" of the United States population.

Wives, husbands, and minor children of United States citizens will continue to be admitted as nonquota immigrants, but I have added to the non-quota-class parents of United States citizens and professors of academic schools.

In an attempt to make the new quota flexible in order to permit the United States to adjust its intake of immigrants in enlightened self-interest to the fast changing political, economic, and social situation of the world, under my new proposal our annual quota will be distributed among five classes of immigrants without regard to national origin, race, or any results of the United States census, as follows: (1) Family unification, (2) occupational class, (3) refugee asylum class, (4) national interest class, and (5) resettlement class.

Within each of the 5 classes, no more than 15 percent of the annual allocation could be issued to inhabitants of any single country. Here is how the annual distribution of the overall immigration quota will be established: Each year the President of the United States, after consulting with the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, and with the Attorney General, would submit to the

Congress, prior to March 1, the proposed allocation for each of the 5 classes, and Congress will have 60 days following the submission of the President's proposal to disapprove it by passing a concurrent resolution. If the proposal is not disapproved by the Congress, it would take effect on the first day of the fiscal year immediately following. If the Congress disagrees with the President, the allocation effective in the preceding fiscal year would automatically become effective.

In order to get the joint executive-legislative responsibility for the annual distribution of the total immigration quota started, I propose that the first Presidential allocation plan shall reach the Congress within 6 months immediately following the enactment of my bill and if agreement is not reached on this first Presidential proposal, the total annual quota of 250,000 would be simply cut across the board so as to give each of the 5 classes 20 percent of the total. This interim allocation would, of course, be valid for the first fiscal year of operations, pending the submission of the next Presidential proposal which, again, will be subject to Congressional disapproval.

My main purpose in proposing this flexible distribution of a permanently fixed annual quota is to permit the President to decide—on a year-to-year basis—with Congressional concurrence, whether it is desirable in any particular year to grant more immigrant visas to relatives of United States citizens or to, say, refugees, or to, perhaps, immigrants possessing special skills needed in the United States at that particular time, or to any of the other classes.

The 15 percent permanent limitation affecting the participation of any single country in the distribution of the fivefold allocation is, in my opinion, a sufficient guaranty that no unfair distribution of visas for the benefit of inhabitants of one particular country would be practicable.

The second revised feature of my bill affects the administration of the law. Under the present law, we have a two-headed system where officials of the Department of State issue visas to both immigrants and nonimmigrants abroad, while officials of the Department of Justice determine at ports of entry whether the holders of visas are admissible to the United States. This is an antiquated, cumbersome, and expensive system. It creates anxiety and uncertainty in the minds of the immigrants and non-

immigrants alike, and it causes friction between two governmental agencies operating independently in the same field and stepping on each other's toes.

Under my proposal, the entire administration of our immigration and nationality laws will be placed in the hands of a Director of Bureau of Immigration and Citizenship, who will be an Assistant Attorney General, subject to confirmation by the Senate. His officers, acting as immigration attachés, will be stationed at our consulates abroad and will issue immigrant and nonimmigrant visas after a finding is made that the recipient of a visa is found to be eligible actually to enter the United States.

In addition to simplification of procedures and elimination of dual standards, as well as uncertainty in the minds of immigrants or foreign visitors, my proposal will automatically open visa issuance to administrative review in the Department of Justice by the well-qualified and trusted Board of Immigration Appeals. The issuance of diplomatic visas will, of course, remain a function of diplomatic officers of the Department of State.

I believe that the administrative system which I propose will not only provide for a more efficient and more equitable issuance of visas abroad, but that it will also bring a great saving to the American taxpayer.

I have every reason to believe that the hearings on immigration will be both intensive and extensive. Twenty-eight Members of Congress have followed me in the introduction of this bill, which is, in itself, a most heartening fact. However, be it noted that the greatest majority of those who introduced identical legislation come from the heavily populated States. While it is reasonable to expect that these States, having benefited from immigration, would be most liberal in immigration matters, it is an indication of the educational work that must be done in the Midwest, Western, and Southern States.

If we, the proponents of liberalized immigration law, do our homework, defer to reason and not passion, drop the name calling which only serves to antagonize and strengthen the opposition, we can, through the forthcoming hearings, if nothing more, at least start the ball rolling toward an immigration law that will do honor to us and proclaim an effective and working democracy to those abroad.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1958

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the living and of the living dead, amid all the tensions of these days which, with their vast issues, demand our utmost that freedom may endure, there come to us constant reminders, as comrades vanish from our side and sight, that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day.

We think gratefully today of a colleague who has passed through the door called death to a larger room of service and progress. As a Member of this body for a long span by our reckoning, he served his State and the Nation and this Capital City. Thou knowest that with faith undimmed, with valor and unbowed head, he met the inroads of bodily affliction.

We remember today his vivid personality; his rugged belief in government not of the elect, but of the elected; his uncompromising candor; his hatred of cant and hypocrisy; his unbroken loyalty to the welfare of the toilers for more abundant life. We are conscious, now that his voice is stilled, of those qualities which bound him as with bands of steel to those who labored by his side.

Emulating our fallen comrade, in a dark day when so many lights have gone out, may we join those who, refusing to curse the darkness, light the candles of faith and hope. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 16, 1958, was dispensed with.

JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order, and I request its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed order will be read.

The order was read, as follows:

Ordered, That in the event the Economic Report of the President is transmitted to the Senate today prior to the adjournment, the letter of transmittal be printed in the Record without reading and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Economic Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is entered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.